

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1409702



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA 91711

3 vols.

88'

17-

21

BX
5125
C48
1890
v.1

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

CHURCH ASSOCIATION, *California*

ESTABLISHED 1865,

To uphold the Doctrines, Principles, and Order of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to counteract the efforts now being made to pervert her teaching on essential points of the Christian faith, or assimilate her Services to those of the Church of Rome, and further to encourage concerted action for the advancement and progress of Spiritual Religion.

Office—14, BUCKINGHAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

Secretary—HENRY MILLER, ESQ.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

THE SECRETARY will be happy to supply Members of the Association with any of the following Tracts free for circulation, and Non-Members at the prices marked against them.

A set of the Tracts (1 to 163) bound in 3 volumes, at 1s per vol., or post free 3s 7½d; in cloth at 1s 6d per vol., or post free 5s 3d. These form a complete Library on the Ritualistic Controversy, and should be in the hands of every Protestant Churchman.

TRACTS.

VOL. I.

- I. **Must we Confess?** By the REV. CANON TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D.*
- II. **The Christian Priesthood.** By the REV. CANON TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D.*
- III. **Prayers for the Dead.** By the REV. CANON TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D.*
- IV. **The Teaching of the Ritualists not the Teaching of the Church of England.**†
- V. **Evening Communion.** By the late REV. CANON BLAKENEY, D.D.*
- VI. **Gospel Freedom and Priestly Tyranny.**†
- VII. **The Dogmatic Teaching of Bible Truths.** By the late REV. CANON GARBETT, M.A.* ¶
- VIII. **The Priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of His Members.** What is it? †

** 1d per dozen, or 6d per 100.

†† 2d per dozen, or 1s per 100.

* 3d per dozen, or 1s 6d per 100.

† 3d per dozen, or 2s per 100.

† 5d per dozen, or 3s per 100.

§§ 8d per dozen, or 4s per 100.

§ 8d per dozen, or 4s 6d per 100.

¶ 10d per dozen, or 6s per 100.

¶ 2d each, or 12s per 100.

¶¶ 3d each, or 15s per 100.

A single copy of any of the Tracts or Leaflets 1d, unless otherwise stated.

- IX. [Will not be reprinted. Tract LVIII. contains exactly the same information.]
- X. **Results of Appeals to the Courts in Ritual Cases.** ¶
- XI. [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- XII. **The Falsification of History, especially in reference to the Reformation.** By the late REV. DR. BOULTBEE. §
- XIII. [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- XIV. [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- XV. **Episcopal Condemnations of Ritualism.** †
- XVI. **Is there Popery in the Prayer Book, Historically considered?** By the late REV. DR. BOULTBEE. §
- XVII. **The Relation of Soundness in the Faith to Spirituality in the Life.** By the VENB. ARCHD. RICHARDSON, M.A. †
- XVIII. **Guilds.** By the REV. G. W. WELDON, M.A. §
- XIX. **Spiritual and Evangelical Religion.**—The best means for the Advancement of. By the REV. TALBOT A. L. GREAVES.*
- XX. **Ritualism and Ritualism.** Why some ought to be supported and some condemned. By the VENB. ARCHD. RICHARDSON, M.A. †
- XXI. **Hymns Ancient and Modern, and their Romanizing Teaching.** By the REV. JAMES ORMISTON. ||
- XXII. **The "Gainsaying of Core?"** By the REV. C. H. WALLER. †
- XXIII. **Incense.** By the REV. HELY H. SMITH.*
- XXIV. **The Bishop of Bath and Wells on the Ritualists.***
- XXV. **The Real Presence.** By the REV. CANON TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D.*
- XXVI. **The Counter-Reformation Movement and How to meet it.** By the REV. A. BARING-GOULD, M.A. †
- XXVII. **Voices of the Church of England on Auricular Confession.** †
- XXVIII. **Confession and Forgiveness of Sins.** By REV. DR. BARDSLEY. †
- XXIX. **What Mean ye by this Service?** §
- XXX. **The Eastward Position.** By the REV. CANON RYLE.* [Now Bp. of Liverpool.]
- XXXI. **Peril of Idolatry and Superfluous Decking of Churches.***
- XXXII. **Public Worship Regulation Act.** §
- XXXIII. **Distinctive Vestments.** By the REV. CANON RYLE. † [Now Bp. of Liverpool.]
- XXXIV. **Privy Council Judgment on Vestments.** ||
- XXXV. **Eastward Position, Privy Council Judgment on.** †
- XXXVI. **Wafer-Bread, Privy Council Judgment on.***
- XXXVII. **The Eastward Position.** By the late REV. C. DALLAS MARSTON, M.A. †
- XXXVIII. **Vestments.** By the late LEONARD ROWE VALPY, Esq. †
- XXXIX. **The Lord's Supper. A.D. 1674.** †

- XL. Exeter Reredos Case.** Judgment of the Privy Council. §
- XLI. Address to Churchwardens—Public Worship Regulation Act.***
- XLII. The Errors of Ritualism have their source in the Unregenerate Human Heart.** By the REV. C. J. GOODHART, M.A.*
- XLIII. The present Tactics of the Ritualists and how to meet them.** By the REV. CANON TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D.†
- XLIV.** *[Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]*
- XLV. The Sacrificial Vestments,—Reasons Against.** By the late REV. CANON BLAKENEY, D.D., LL.D.*
- XLVI. The Eastward Position,—Reasons Against.** By the late REV. CANON BLAKENEY, D.D., LL.D.*
- XLVII.** *[Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]*
- XLVIII. The Past Action of the Church Association, and the importance of maintaining it in increased efficiency in the future.** By the REV. G. W. WELDON, M.A.||
- XLIX. The Church of England is Protestant.** Historical Testimony. By the late I. P. FLEMING, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.¶
- L. The Nature of Christian Worship.** By the REV. CANON BELL, M.A. §
- LI. The Importance of the Issues at Stake in the Legal Proceedings of the Church Association.** By the REV. DR. BARDSLEY.||
- LII. Special Missions and Services; their Advantages and Dangers.** By the VENB. ARCHD. RICHARDSON, M.A.†
- LIII. Ritualism; Extent of the Outbreak and Need of More Earnest Action on the Part of the Laity.** By JAMES BATEMAN, Esq.*
- LIV. Branch Associations—How best can their action be brought into closer connection with that of the Council.** By JAMES INSKIP, Esq.†
- LV. Reasons for opposing Ritualism.** By the REV. CANON RYLE, D.D.* *[Now Bp. of Liverpool.]*
- LVI. What dowee to the Reformation?** By the REV. CANON RYLE, D.D.¶ *[Now Bp. of Liverpool.]*
- LVII. Absolution and Confession.** The Mind of the Church of England as shown in the Homilies.†
- LVIII. Address by the Council.** Showing the duties of Bishops, Archdeacons, Churchwardens, and Parishioners. Also abstract of points decided in the Ecclesiastical Courts.†
- LIX. Church Armour.** By the REV. CANON TAYLOR.†
- LX. Ridsdale Judgment: Testimony it affords to the Protestant character of the Church of England.** By the REV. G. W. WELDON.||

VOL. II.

- LXI. What practical course of action should now be taken to give effect to the various Judgments?** By REV. CANON RYLE, D.D. § *[Now Bp. of Liverpool.]*
- LXII. Episcopal Responsibility.** The advisability of the issue of Visitation Articles. By the late I. P. FLEMING, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.||

- LXIII. **The Confessional, the best means of arousing and sustaining public opinion on the subject.** By the REV. CANON TAYLOR, D.D.†
- LXIV. **Theological instruction of candidates for the Ministry.** By the late REV. CANON BLAKENEY, D.D.†
- LXV. *[Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]*
- LXVI. **The Gown in the Pulpit.** By the REV. WILLIAM FLEMING, LL.B.¶
- LXVII. **Ritualism : A Romeward Movement.***
- LXVIII. **The Distinctive Principles of the Church of England.** By the REV. CANON RYLE, D.D.¶ *[Now Bp. of Liverpool.]*
- LXIX. **The Administration of the Law—The Present Aspect of, relative to Ecclesiastical Offences.** By JAMES INSKIP, Esq.§
- LXX. **Evangelical Churchmen True Churchmen.** By the REV. DR. BARDSLEY.||
- LXXI. **Church Architecture: its Proper Relation to Simple Christian Worship.** By A. R. PITE, Esq.§
- LXXII. **The Ritualistic Conspiracy—The True History of.**
- LXXIII. **Dean Burgon's Letter to Canon Gregory.**§
- LXXIV. **The Rights of the Laity—Existing Tendencies to Encroach on.** By the late I. P. FLEMING, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.||
- LXXV. **Secret Societies.** By the REV. HELY HUTCHINSON SMITH, M.A.||
- LXXVI. **Evangelical Protestantism. The only sure means of resisting superstition and infidelity.** By the late REV. CANON CLAYTON.§
- LXXVII. **The Rights of the Laity imperilled by the spread of Sacerdotalism and the Inaction of the Bishops.** By THOMAS SMELT, Esq.||
- LXXVIII. **Shall we go back to the Prayer Book of 1549 ?§**
- LXXIX. **Should the Church Association be dissolved or strengthened by those who value the English Reformation ?***
- LXXX. **Speech of J. M. Holt, Esq., at Willis's Rooms, 8th May, 1883.†**
- LXXXI. *[Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]*
- LXXXII. **The Reactionary and Retrograde Tendency of Ritualism Evidenced by the Proposed Recurrence to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.** By the REV. SEPTIMUS HOBBS.†
- LXXXIII. **The Secrets of Ritualism.** By REV. C. H. WAINWRIGHT, M.A.§
- LXXXIV. **The Constitutional Settlement of Church and State.**§
- LXXXV. **Ritualism Grows; What Next, and Next?** By Rev. J. W. JOHNSON, M.A.†
- LXXXVI. **1686 and 1886.** By The Rt. Hon. LORD ROBERT MONTAGU.†
- LXXXVII. **"Hearing Mass" versus "The Lord's Supper or Holy Communion."**§
- LXXXVIII. **The North Side of the Table.** An Historical Enquiry as to the Origin and Meaning of the Fourth Rubric in the Communion Service.¶

LXXXIX. **Additional Evidence respecting the Ornaments**
Rubric of 1662. Part I.||

XC. **The Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth.**†

XCI. **Altar Lights: Their History and Meaning.**||

XCII. **The Mixed Chalice.**†

XCI. **Additional Evidence respecting the Ornaments**
Rubric of 1662. Part II.†

XCIV. **The Doctrine of a 'Spiritual' Presence as taught**
by the Ritualists.†

XCV. **Teaching of the Catechism as to the Lord's**
Supper.*

XCVI. **The Bishops' Veto.**§

XCVII. **Idols in the Church of God.** By the Rev. T. J. GASTER.

XCVIII. **The Misprinted Catechism, or the definition of**
"this word Sacrament" as now substituted by "privileged"
Printers for that of the Church of England. By J. T.
TOMLINSON.||

XCIX. **Non-communicating Attendance at Holy Com-**
munion.* The Opinion of Professors of Divinity at Oxford
and Cambridge.

C. **"The Priest and the Privy Council."** Contains a
reply to all the more usual misrepresentations of the Privy
Council Judgments which are put forth from time to time by
Ritualists. Price 4d.

VOL. III.

CI. **Are Crucifixes in Churches Lawful.**†

CII. **Into their Hands.** A plea for the old way of "Taking"
the Bread at the Holy Communion.§

CIII. **Ecclesiastical Prosecutions originated and**
advocated by the English Church Union.†

CIV. **Jurisdiction of English Metropolitans.** Judgment
of Archbishop of Canterbury in the Lincoln Case.¶

CV. **St. Paul's Reredos Case.** Judgment on Bishops' Veto
in Queen's Bench.¶

CVI. **A Defence of the Church Association.** A reply to
two Attacks by Sydney Gedge, Esq., M.P. (Solicitor to the
School Board), in the *Churchman* of May and Sept., 1889.¶

CVII. **Mr. Jas. Parker's Attack upon the Judicial**
Committee of the Privy Council.§

CVIII. **Sheppard v. Bennett.** Privy Council Judgment.¶

CIX. **The Dean of Peterborough's Plan.** Extracts from a
Paper by Mr. CHANCELLOR DIBDIN.†

CX. **Folkestone Ritual Judgment.**¶

CXI. **The Threatened Revival of Canon Law in the**
Church of England. By J. T. TOMLINSON.†

CXII. **Reservation of the Host.** An Examination of the
Reply of the C. B. S. to the Resolutions of the Upper Houses
of Convocation, 185. By J. T. TOMLINSON.§

- CXIII. **The Sarum Mass compared with the Communion** - Office of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. By J. T. TOMLINSON. Price 4d.
- CXIV. **Prosecutions for Ritual Observances.** A Reply to the Dean of Canterbury. By the Right Rev. BISHOP ALFORD, D.D. §
- The following, hitherto known as Leaflets 1 to 45, will in future be known as Tracts CXV. to CLIX.*
- CXV. (1.) **Declaration of the Church Association.***
- CXVI. (2.) **The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.††**
- CXVII. (3.) **Apostolic Succession.****
- CXVIII. (4.) **Lord Sandon on Sacerdotalism.††**
- CXIX. (5.) **What did our Reformers Teach?††**
- CXX. (6.) **What Ritualism is!††**
- CXXI. (7.) **What Puseyism is!††**
- CXXII. (8.) [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- CXXIII. (9.) [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- CXXIV. (10.) **The Plan of the Campaign.††**
- CXXV. (11.) [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- CXXVI. (12.) **Prayers for the Dead.** Extract from Homily XIX., Third Part.††
- CXXVII. (13.) **Confession.** The Bishop of Peterborough on.††
- CXXVIII. (14.) **Confession.** Utterances of the Episcopal Bench on.*
- CXXIX. (15.) **Gown v. Surplice.***
- CXXX. (16.) **Form of Prayer,** for those interested in the Society's work.††
- CXXXI. (17.) [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- CXXXII. (18.) **Lord Harrowby (the late) on Auricular Confession.**
- CXXXIII. (19.) **Collect to be used in the Present Crisis.††**
- CXXXIV. (20.) **Vestments—Condemnation of.††**
- CXXXV. (21.) [Out of print. Will not be reprinted.]
- CXXXVI. (22.) **The Eastward Position.** By the REV. CANON RYLE, D.D.††
- CXXXVII. (23.) **Vestments—Twelve Reasons against.** By REV. CANON RYLE, D.D.††
- CXXXVIII. (24.) **Church Hymnals.**—The special need of care in Selection.††
- CXXXIX. (25.) **A High Church Clergyman on the Ritualists.††**
- CXL. (26.) **The Priesthood of Christ.** By the REV. CANON RYLE, D.D.††
- CXLI. (27.) **P. P. P. Popery's Poetical Pioneer.††**
- CXLII. (28.) **Bishop Wilberforce on Confession.****
- CXLIII. (29.) **Justice not Persecution.††**
- CXLIV. (30.) **The Dean of Chichester on Ritualism.††**
- CXLV. (31.) **Lament of England's Church.** By the late VERY REV. Dean H. LAW.*
- CXLVI. (32.) **The Church Rights of Parishioners.** By the Rt Hon. LORD COCKBURN.††
- CXLVII. (33.) **What do the Times require?** By the REV. CANON RYLE, D.D.*
- CXLVIII. (34.) **The Ornaments Rubric.***
- CXLIX. (35.) **The Illegality of Crosses.** Judgment in MARSTERS v. DURST.*
- CL. (36.) **Proposal by the Chairman of the English Church Union to bring back the Liturgy of 1549.** Speech by the REV. CANON HOARE.††
- CLI. (37.) **Holy Scripture versus the Eastward Position.**

- CLII. (38.) **Dean Oakley's Correspondence with Prebendary Macdonald.**††
- CLIII. (39.) **The Crucifix at St. Paul's.**††
- CLIV. (40.) **King Edward VI. and his Altar Lights.**††
- CLV. (41.) **Luther's Ritualism.**††
- CLVI. (42.) **Cross Bearers.**††
- CLVII. (43.) **The Candour of Lord Halifax.**††
- CLVIII. (44.) **The Eastward Position.***
- CLIX. (45.) **The Work of the Church Association.** By the REV. CANON CHRISTOPHER.††
- CLX. **The Three Religions. Which is yours?** (Abridged.) By the REV. J. B. WADDINGTON.††
- CLXI. **Questions for the Laity.** (Abridged.) By the REV. J. B. WADDINGTON.††
- CLXII. **The Teaching of Ritualism; and the Teaching of the Church of England.** (Abridged.) By the REV. J. B. WADDINGTON.††
- CLXIII. **The Great Controversy: Which is the Channel of Salvation? Faith? or The Sacraments?** By the REV. J. B. WADDINGTON.††

Persons who already possess Vols. 1 and 2 of the Tracts, and propose purchasing Vol. 3, are requested to observe its contents from the above Catalogue. In order to secure consecutive numbering it has been necessary to bind in Vol. 3 a number of the Leaflets which were in Vol. 2.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE FOREGOING LIST.

CLASS I.—"RITUALISM."

- RITUALISM, IN GENERAL, NOS. 4, 20, 26, 29, 42, 43, 53, 55, 67, 72, 73, 83, 85, 119, 120, 121, 124, 139, 144, 145, 152, 162.
- FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY, 12, 155.
- PROTESTANTISM OF THE PRAYER BOOK, 16.
- HOMILIES, 31, 57, 126.
- PRAYER BOOK OF 1549, 78, 82, 113, 150.
- HYMNALS, 21, 138, 141.
- THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC, 89, 93, 109, 148.
- THE LAITY, 74, 77, 146.
- CHURCHWARDENS (UNDER P. W. R. Act), 41.
- MISSIONS, 52.
- BISHOPS' CONDEMNATION OF RITUALISM, 15, 24, 67, 143.
- BISHOPS' DUTIES, 62.
- EVENING COMMUNIONS, 5.
- PROSECUTIONS ORIGINATED BY THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION, 103.

CLASS II.—RITUALISTIC PRACTICES.

- RESERVATION OF HOST, 112.
- PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD, 3, 126.
- GUILDS AND SECRET SOCIETIES, 18, 75, compare 83.
- HEARING MASS, 87, 99.
- NORTH SIDE OF TABLE, 88.
- INCENSE, 23.
- VESTMENTS, 33, 34, 38, 45, 134, 137.
- EASTWARD POSITION, 30, 37, 39, 46, compare 51; 136, 151, 158.
- PREACHING DRESS, 66, 129.
- ARCHITECTURE, 71, 101.
- ALTAR LIGHTS, 91, 154.
- THE MIXED CHALICE, 92.
- IDOLS IN THE CHURCH OF GOD, 97, 153.
- ATTACKS ON THE PRIVY COUNCIL, 100, 107.

CLASS III.—CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

- ORGANIZATION, &c., 48, 54, 63, 79, 80, 81, 106, 159.
- DEFENCE, 106, 113, 159.

CLASS IV.—LEGAL STANDARDS.

- P. W. R. ACT, 32; COMMENTS ON, 41.
- PURCHAS JUDGMENT, 35 (Eastward Position), 36 (Wafers)
- MARSTERS *v.* DURST, JUDGMENT, 149 (Altar Cross).
- BOYD *v.* PHILPOTTS (Reredos), 40.
- ABSTRACTS OF LEGAL DECISIONS, 10, 58, 34 (Vestments).
- COMMENTS ON LEGAL DECISIONS, 51, 60, 61 (Ridsdale Judgment).
- THE VETO, 96, 105.
- THE ADVERTISEMENTS OF Q. ELIZABETH, 90.
- THE MISPRINTED CATECHISM, 98.
- JURISDICTION OF ENGLISH METROPOLITANS, 104, 157.
- REREDOS, ST. PAUL'S, 105.
- SHEPPARD *v.* BENNETT, 108.
- RIDSDALE *v.* CLIFTON, 110.
- CANON LAW, 111.

CLASS V.—DOCTRINAL.

- CONFESSION, 1, 27, 28, 57, 63, 127, 128, 132, 142.
- PRIESTHOOD, 2, 8, 117, 118, 140.
- DOGMATIC TEACHING, 6, 7, 64, 68, 70, 76, 115.
- THE "GAINSAING OF KORAH," 22.
- THE "REAL" PRESENCE, 25, 94, 102, 116.
- A CATECHISM, 59.
- SARUM MASS, 113.

CLASS VI.—DEVOTIONAL.

- 17, 19, 50, 130, 133, 160, 161, 163

CLASS VII.—PROTESTANTISM.

- 16, 49, 56, 84, 86, 147.

CHURCH ASSOCIATION LITERATURE.

*The Venerable Archdeacon Taylor, D.D., says:—*Allow me to call the attention of Protestant Churchmen, and especially the clergy, to the most valuable volumes of tracts published by the Church Association 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London. They constitute a perfect armoury in defence of Protestant truth, and supply a magazine, or treasure-house, of the most reliable information as to the facts and doctrines of the Reformation, combined with an exposure of the doings, tactics, and designs of its enemies, who have now, alas! through the culpable connivance, or carelessness, of the authorities been permitted to entrench themselves within the very citadel.

I would strongly recommend my brethren to get these three volumes (over 1300 pages), to read them right through, mark and index them, so as to have ready access to their varied contents. They would find them most useful in the present struggle. They are of the most part carefully-prepared papers by competent men—experts on the subjects of which they treat. In fact, they contain an amount of legal, historical, and theological information which cannot be too highly estimated; and their moderate price (3 vols., 3s 7½d post free) puts them within the reach of all.

*The Rev. Canon Christopher says:—*The three volumes of the above tracts will enable any faithful churchman of ordinary intelligence and education, to confute any number of the sophistical arguments of Ritualistic writers and lecturers. These tracts might preserve many a young man from Ritualistic infection, fortifying his system by facts and arguments against Romanizing teaching, and preserving him from wasting his life in the promotion of religious errors.

*The Rev. Handley G. Moule says:—*I think highly of these volumes. The papers are inevitably somewhat unequal in value, but the large majority are very good indeed.

*The Rev. C. H. Waller says:—*In my opinion these volumes contain much wholesome instruction and information necessary for these times. Several valuable papers by my revered predecessor, Dr. Boulton, are there, and I do not know where to put my hand upon so much that is useful in so small a compass upon questions of that kind.

*The Principal of Wycliffe College, Toronto, says:—*I have found the tracts of the Church Association of great practical value. They constitute a well-furnished armoury, giving in an available form the historical and theological data necessary to meet the assertions and contentions of Ritualists and Sacerdotalists, and setting forth the teachings of our Reformed Church in regard to the questions at issue, and the authoritative decisions of her highest tribunals. Our graduates have, in many cases, proved their value in controversy; and I believe that no better work could be done by those who are seeking to protect our Communion from the inroads of error, than to place a copy of these tracts in the hand of every evangelical clergyman and of every churchwarden, lay delegate and influential layman in our midst. A small expenditure in this direction would prove very fruitful in results.

*The Rev. G. M. Wrong, of Wycliffe College, Toronto, says:—*I can add my own testimony to the value of these volumes. Many loose statements are being made nowadays on many controverted points and a collection of the tracts is a mine of information that every evangelical churchman should have at hand to draw from.

PROTESTANT BOOKLETS.

NEW SERIES.

- I. A Talk with the Vicar. By EMILY S. HOLT.||
- II. The Crucifix at St. Paul's (*illustrated*).||
- III. Why are we Protestants? By EMILY S. HOLT. §§
- IV. Queen Elizabeth's Crucifix. By J. T. TOMLINSON.||
- V. The New Graven Images at St. Paul's Cathedral. By EMILY S. HOLT.||

SPECIAL MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS.

The Church Intelligencer, the Organ of the Church Association, published monthly, price 1d; Annual Subscription, free by post, 1s 6d.

Remarks on the Prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln.

Reprint of letters by "Laicus," from the *Times*.

Statements by the Leaders of the Ritualistic Party as to the importance of the points at issue.

Archdeacon Farrar on the Lincoln Case.

The People's Verdict. Total Defeat of Supporter of the Bishop of Lincoln.

The Church of England Almanack for 1891. Price 1d; or interleaved for Notes, 2d. Bound in cloth, gilt edges, interleaved for Notes, Price 6d. Postage extra. Protestant Churchmen are asked to co-operate in the circulation of this Almanack which will be ready on November 1st.

GENERAL MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS.

	PRICE. s. d.
The Best Work on the Prayer Book is that by the REV. CANON BLAKENEY, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, in its History and Interpretation."	14 0
Our Organization and its Requirements. By H. MILLER, Esq.	0 1
Letter to Archbishop of York on Report on Ecclesiastical Courts. By SIR E. BECKETT, BART., LL.D., q.c. (now Lord Grimthorpe)	0 2
The "Legal History" of Canon Stubbs. By J. T. TOMLINSON, Esq.	0 6
Worship and Ritual. By the REV. E. A. LITTON, cloth cover	1 0
Ditto Ditto. paper cover	0 6
The Lord's Supper. By the late REV. CANON BLAKENEY, D.D., cloth cover	1 0
Ditto Ditto. paper cover	0 6

	PRICE. s. d.
Protestant Standards of the Church of England.	
By the REV. WM. FLEMING, LL.B.	0 3
Crucifixes and Roods in Churches	0 2
Is There not a Cause?	0 1
Is There not a Cause? (From the <i>English Churchman</i>)	0 1
The Mass in the Church of England. By the late REV. CANON BLAKENEY, LL.D.	0 3
The Confessional. By the late REV. CANON MILLER, D.D.	0 3
Causes of the Reformation. By the late REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR... ..	0 3
* The Uncertainties of the Church of Rome. Ditto	0 6
* The Priests of the Three Temples. By the late REV. GEO. W. WELDON	0 6
* Principles at Stake. By the REV. J. B. LOWE, D.D. ...	0 6
* The Christian Ministry. By the late REV. CANON BARDSLEY	0 6
* The above four, bound in cloth	2 6
Why and Because. By the REV. HELY H. SMITH ...	0 1
Dangers of the Use of Painted Windows in Churches. By the REV. J. GRITTON, D.D.	0 4
Doctrine of the Real Presence. By the late REV. C. F. CHASE	1 0
Some Strictures on the Communicants' Manual. By the REV. C. J. ELLIOTT	0 2
The Crisis in the Church the Crisis of the Nation. By JUNIUS JUNIOR	0 2
Actual Results of the Habit of Auricular Con- fession. By the REV. B. W. SAVILE, M.A.	0 6
Episcopal Patronage. By MR. W. WALSH	0 6
Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament? What it is	0 1
The English Church Union a Romanizing Con- federacy	0 6
The Mass, a Masquerade	0 1
People's Edition (Public Worship Regulation Act)	0 1
A Review of Church Events in 1868-9	0 1
The Position of the Laity in the Church of Eng- land	0 1
An Examination of a Pastoral Letter	0 1
Church Reform	0 1
Lay Comments on Church Topics of 1870-1 ...	0 1
Memorial to Royal Commissioners on Ecclesias- tical Courts	0 4
Catholic Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice ...	0 4
Five Counter Theories to the Ridsdale Judgment	0 4

	PRICE. s. d.
Church and Liberties of England. By REV. NEVISON LORAINÉ	0 6
Annual Report of the Church Association	1 0
Hymns suitable for Church Association Meetings per 100	1 0
Twelve Reasons for Opposing the English Church Union per 100	1 6
The Church of England Working Men's Society a Romanising Confederacy per 100	2 6
Ditto per 100	1 6
An Appeal to the Laity, to Oppose Ritualism. By the BISHOP OF PETERBORO' per 100	1 6
The Ritualistic Conspiracy. By A. W. BRENES ...	0 3
Maude, or the Anglican Sister of Mercy. By MISS WHATELEY	1 6
Words of Warning. By the REV. T. J. GASTER. Being notes on the "Communicant's Manual, by REV. M. F. SADLER" per 100	1 6
Sketch of the Life of Bishop King. J. HANCHARD	0 1
The Doctrine of the Real Presence, &c. REV. C. F. CHASE, M.A.	1 0
Evening Communion. By REV. J. J. BEDDOW	0 2
The Loving Sacrifice: a Misleading Book. By PRESBYTER ANGLICANUS	0 6
Our Danger and Our Safety. An Address by Rev. SEPTIMUS HOBBS	0 2
The Church and the Franchise. By A. S. LAMB, ESQ.	1 0
St. Paul on Idols and Idols in St. Paul's. By REV. J. ORMISTON	0 1
Crosses, Crucifixes and Musical Services. By Rev. A. METCALFE	0 1
Appalling Facts. By J. COLEY	0 2
Ritualism: What it is and what it teaches ...	0 2
Reasons against Images in Churches. By W. H. TUCKER	0 2
Foxe's Book of Martyrs	0 1
What is Ritualism? By The Lord BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL, per 100	1 0

Orders for any of the above should be sent to Mr. HENRY MILLER, Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand; JOHN F. SHAW & Co., 48, Paternoster Row, E.C.; or JOHN KENSIT, 18, Paternoster Row, E.C.

The Church Association

Was instituted in 1865 to Uphold the Doctrines, Principles, and Order of the Church of England, and to counteract the efforts now being made to pervert her teaching on essential points of the Christian faith, or assimilate her Services to those of the Church of Rome, and further, to encourage concerted action for the advancement and progress of Spiritual Religion.

The Church Association seeks to resist all innovations in the order of the Service as prescribed by the joint authority of the Church and State—whether in vestments, ornaments, gestures, or practices borrowed from the Church of Rome, and symbolical of her errors—and especially to prevent the idolatrous adoration of the elements in the Lord's Supper, contrary to the order of our Communion Service and the terms both of the Liturgy and Articles.

The Church Association seeks to resist all attempts to restore the use of the Confessional, and every exercise of that Priestly authority which was put down at the Reformation, and also to oppose the introduction of doctrines contrary to the teaching of the Church, as set forth in her Liturgy and Articles.

The Church Association seeks to effect these objects by publicity through Lectures, Meetings, and the use of the Press, by Appeals to the Courts of Law in order to obtain a clear decision what the Law is, and by Appeals to Parliament to pass such measures as may be needed to restrain clergymen from violating the order of their Church, and obtruding on their parishioners practices and doctrines repugnant to the Formularies and Articles of our Reformed Church.

The Church Association has at considerable cost obtained the condemnation by the Ecclesiastical Courts of SIXTY ceremonies and practices symbolical of Popish Doctrines illegally introduced by the Ritualists into the Services of our Reformed Church.

The Church Association has circulated literature "wholesome and necessary" for these times,—millions of Pamphlets and Tracts against Ritualism—and by these means the country has been awakened to the dangers of the Ritualistic "Conspiracy." In this department the Association is really a Church of England Protestant Tract Society.

The Church Association.

The Church Association has no sympathy with imprisonment of clergymen for Contempt of Court. It is promoting in Parliament a Bill which, if passed, will substitute Deprivation for Imprisonment.

The Church Association has also introduced a Bill into Parliament to abolish the Bishop's Veto, which at present bars the Laity from their right of appealing to the Ecclesiastical Courts in cases where the Romish Mass is thrust upon them in their Parish Churches.

The Church Association has to cope with lawlessness in high places, and to defend the interests of Law, Order, and Truth, with this view.

The Church Association has taken proceedings against the Bishop of Lincoln for illegal practices in his Cathedral.

The Church Association has also taken proceedings against the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral for having erected a Crucifix and a Madonna in the Metropolitan Cathedral.

The Church Association has to satisfy appeals for advice, guidance, and help which surge from distressed and oppressed congregations.

The Church Association has to abet and aid Protestant Home Mission-work, to assist those involved in controversy, to furnish papers on matters that arise affecting Evangelical religion, and to provide suitable Lectures.

The Church Association has to devise how to meet the schemes of Sacerdotalism in the widening arena of Politics.

The Church Association has to guard the interests of the Laity in all Church matters, especially in the matter of "Church Reform."

The Church Association has to check by every available means the attempted revival of sacerdotal caste privileges, and "benefit of clergy."

The Church Association has to contest the ground inch by inch in fighting the battle of the Reformation and defending the Constitutional Settlement of Church and State.

The Church Association appeals for support—Because it is necessary to oppose Ritualism, as helping to thrust upon the unwary the Popery which was cast out at the Reformation, and which made England cringe to a foreign potentate, kept back the Bible from our people, deluged our land with superstition and ignorance, and burned our Protestant Reformers.

The Church Association.

The Church Association should be supported by all Protestant Churchmen. Because a powerful organization is needed to oppose the thoroughly organized efforts of those who are trying to undo the work of the Reformation; and it is the only organization with the special object of opposing the numerous agencies of Ritualism.

The Church Association should be supported by all Protestant Churchmen, because the "English Church Union," the "Society of the Holy Cross," the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament," the "Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom," and numerous Guilds, Brotherhoods, and Sisterhoods are actively promoting the avowed object of "un-Protestantizing" our Church.

The Church Association should be supported by all Protestant Churchmen because a large number of Clergy and Laity have joined the Church of Rome, and a much larger number have adopted thoroughly Romish doctrines and practices while still continuing in the Church of England; therefore all Protestant Clergy and Laity should support the only Society exclusively devoted to the work of defending the Protestantism of our Church.

The Church Association should be supported by all Protestant Churchmen, because good Churchmanship, as well as good citizenship, demands that the law now clearly decided should be obeyed.

The Church Association should be supported by all Protestant Churchmen, because the Ritualists are endeavouring to bring English men, women, and even children within the unhealthy and unhallowed influences of the Confessional, to which the Association is most resolutely opposed.

The Church Association should be supported by all Protestant Churchmen, because though God alone can defend our Church and country from all dangers, religious or national—and to Him must be all the glory of giving us the victory—He expects His servants as His instruments, to be "workers together with Him," to "earnestly contend for the faith," and, when His truth and honour are concerned, to be careful that we and our Church are "*first pure, then peaceable.*"

The Church Association furnishes, by means of its monthly organ, "THE CHURCH INTELLIGENCER," exact information as to controverted points in the meaning and structure of the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-nine Articles and the Formularies; calls attention to attacks upon the Protestant principles of the Reformed Church of England, whether in Parliament, in Convocation, or in the Press; analyzes the drift of the movement for increasing sacerdotal privileges and assumptions, and especially the tendency to vest irre-

The Church Association.

sponsible power in the hands of the Bishops, and is a channel for the exchange of thought between Churchmen who value these objects. "THE CHURCH INTELLIGENCER" costs one penny per month, and may be ordered of any bookseller.

The Church Association issues three volumes of Tracts of over thirteen hundred pages. These volumes deal with nearly every point of the Ritualistic Controversy, and show the practices which have been condemned as unlawful in the Church of England. They form a complete Library on the Ritualistic controversy, should be in the hands of every Protestant Churchman throughout the country. Sent free by post, 3s 7½d. The Tracts may also be had separately.

The Church Association has published an Almanack for the pocket, price one penny, which is full of interesting matter. Churchwarden's Law. The word "Altar" inadmissible. The Law as to Daily Service. Statistics as to the Ritualistic conspiracy. Dates of principal events in Reformation. Lists of Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Chancellors. Table of Lessons for every day in the year. Sunday Notes for Clergy, &c., &c., &c.

The Church Association therefore very earnestly appeals for increased support in the present critical position of the Church of our Fathers, because the position taken up by the Church Association is that of Protestantism against Popery—of Evangelicalism against Sacerdotalism—of the simple Gospel of the grace of God against its counterfeits and corruptions under the fascinating guise of an old heresy under a new face.

The Church Association enrolls Working Men Subscribers at 1s each; Associates at 5s; Lay Members at 10s; Clerical Members at 5s.

The work is greatly crippled for want of adequate funds, urgent appeals for help from aggrieved Parishioners are unwillingly rejected on this account. Increased support means increased work. The Council would say with Bishop Barrington, "If the Reformation was worth establishing it is worth maintaining, but it can only be maintained by a constant vigilance in support of those principles which effected it in the sixteenth century."

All Special Donations and Subscriptions to carry on the work indicated above should be sent to the Secretary, Mr. HENRY MILLER, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London; or may be paid to the account of the Association at the Bank of Messrs. BARCLAY, RANSOM & CO., 54, Lombard Street, E.C., and 2, Pall Mall East, London, S.W.



The National Protestant League

in connection with

The + Church + Association.

✧ Objects of the League. ✧

1. To maintain unimpaired "the Protestant Reformed Religion, established by law," and to defend it against all encroachments of Popery.
2. To spread sound Protestant Truth in the Church of England.
3. To unite in prayer for the increase of Spiritual Religion.
4. To co-operate with the Church Association in upholding Reformation Principles; to educate the Young in Evangelical Truth; and to disseminate sound and wholesome literature.
5. To secure the return of Protestant Candidates at Parliamentary Elections.

Methods of Working the League.

1. The formation of Lodges in Towns and Villages.
2. Social gatherings in Drawing Rooms, School Rooms, or Gardens.
3. Public Meetings, Lectures or Tea Meetings, to give information, report progress, and to confer.
4. Meetings for Prayer.
5. Distribution of Literature.
6. Classes for Instruction.
7. Obtaining Signatures to Petitions.

Statutes of the League.

1. Each Member of the League (male or female) shall pay One Shilling per annum.

2. Each Member of the League shall undertake to devote his (or her) best ability to maintain the Protestant Religion, and to secure the return of Protestant Candidates at Parliamentary Elections.

3. Each Member shall receive from the Council of the Church Association in London the Diploma of the League; and a Badge can be purchased.

4. Any six or more persons in a Town or Village may form a Lodge, and call a meeting to enrol Members.

5. The President and Vice-Presidents of a Lodge shall pay Two Shillings and Sixpence per annum.

6. Not less than one-half of the Subscriptions received through a Lodge shall be remitted to London, the remainder being retained for local expenses. The Diplomas for Members of a Lodge will be forwarded from London on receipt (from the Lodge Secretary) of the half Subscriptions and names and addresses.

7. Each Lodge shall be governed by a Committee elected annually by its Members, such Committee being responsible to the Council of the Church Association in London.

8. Every Lodge shall, if possible, hold two Public Meetings or Lectures each year, and a special meeting of a Lodge shall be called whenever necessary, to consider any important matter referred to it by the London Council.

9. Minutes of Meetings, and a Register of Members and Associates shall be kept by every Lodge, and a brief Report of work done and progress made should be forwarded each year to the London Council.

The National Protestant League

in connection with

The Church Association.

Why should I join it?

1. BECAUSE it seeks to give to the laity their legitimate share in the administration of Parish affairs.
2. BECAUSE it seeks to develop the Church rights of the People by preventing the abuses of so-called "Patronage," and the denial of justice by the arbitrary Veto of the bishops.
3. BECAUSE it claims that parishioners shall not be subjected to unwelcome and illegal changes in their accustomed mode of worship, whether with or without the connivance of the bishop.
4. BECAUSE it seeks to prevent the introduction into our Churches of the sacrifice of the Mass, and the idolatrous worship of consecrated wafers, by the "One-Man Power" of a disloyal priest.
5. BECAUSE it seeks to compel the bishops to administer the law of the land as laid down by Her Majesty's Judges.
6. BECAUSE it refuses to admit that clergymen should be exempt from the control of the Crown, or from obedience to the laws which regulate the conduct of every class in the community.
7. BECAUSE it witnesses that the "Church" in the New Testament did not mean the clergy (whether in or out of Convocation) but the "Congregation of faithful men," mentioned in Art. xix.

8. BECAUSE it seeks to make the "Voice of the Church" (i.e., the voice of the People who form the Church) the recognised arbiter in settling Church disputes (St. Matt. xviii.-17).
9. BECAUSE it enforces the responsibility belonging to citizenship in a Christian land, of selecting representatives in Parliament who shall give effect to this programme, and abolish the unchristian divorce between the "secular" and "spiritual" departments of human life, both of which equally and alike belong to God.
10. BECAUSE it upholds liberty of conscience as a first principle of political Freedom, and upholds Civil and Religious Liberty, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech for Churchmen and Nonconformists alike.
11. BECAUSE it maintains the right of every man to "come boldly to the throne of Grace," through the One Mediator (1 Tim. ii. 5), without the intervention of Priest or Prelate.
12. BECAUSE it upholds the liberties of the people, and by uniting them in a powerful League affords them the opportunity of making their influence felt in a manner which, as individuals, they would be powerless to do.

Every lover of his Country, and friend of Civil and Religious Liberty, should join the League.

Diploma sent on receipt of 1s subscription. All information from

The Registrar, HENRY MILLER,

14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London.

N.B.—*This is not a new Society*, but a further development of the work of the Church Association for the purpose of enabling Protestant Working Men and Women to take a part in the great work which the Association has in hand.

BY THE REV. W. F. TAYLOR, LL.D.,

Incumbent of St. Silas', Liverpool.

MUST WE CONFESS?

YES, without confession there cannot be absolution. But the question is, *to whom* are we to confess?

The Ritualists and Romanists, for their teaching is much the same on this point, maintain that we must confess to a human priest; that the confession should be complete, and private. In fact, the doctrine and necessity of *auricular confession* are taught by both. Auricular confession means a confession which is poured secretly into the ear of the priest. Hence, there are what are called confessional boxes in Romish churches, and also in some Ritualistic churches. The priest sits inside the box and, through a grating to which he applies his ear, receives the confession of the penitent.

The necessity for this confession is said to be this—That God dispenses his pardon *through* the absolution of the priest: and that this is the ordinary method of our obtaining forgiveness. We are told that in Baptism all are pardoned; but as men fall into sin after that ordinance, God has appointed the sacrament of penance to be a “*second plank after shipwreck*” on which the poor sinner may escape.

Thus, the Ritualists teach us that “the priest cannot of his own power or holiness forgive, but that the most precious blood of Christ cleanses us *through the ministry of the priest.*” (Little P. Book, p. 27.)

The same book tells us to confess all our sins, mortal and venial, to a priest, and then we are to say:

“For these and for all other sins which I cannot now remember, I am heartily sorry, I resolve never to commit them again, and most humbly ask pardon of God, and *penance*, counsel, and ABSOLUTION of you, my ghostly father.”

Another little book, “The Plain Guide,” says:—

“As you were washed from your sins at Holy Baptism, you may be *washed again by the Absolution* spoken to you in God’s name by the priest.”—p. 56.

Observe, they do not teach that the priest can of himself forgive sin, neither do the Romanists, but that “the priest acts for God.”

“The priest is to act in God’s stead, whose ambassador he is. He is *like a judge* pronouncing judgment—acquitting or else condemning—binding or loosing.” (Gresley’s Ordinance of Confession, p. 96.)

We now understand the doctrine of the Ritualists on the sub-

ject of confession. They say we must confess to the priest—in order to obtain pardon from God through his ministry, whilst he pronounces the words of absolution,—“I absolve thee,” over our heads.

If this be so, we see at once what a tremendous power this dogma lodges in the hands of the priest. Practically he holds our eternal destinies in his hands; and not only so, but there is an end of that spiritual liberty which consists in being privileged *to go direct to Christ for pardon* and absolution without any human or priestly intervention.

Self-respect is broken down when a man is obliged to reveal his most secret thoughts and feelings to a fellow sinner, and by the act of confession to another, we bring ourselves under a thralldom which is worse than if our limbs were clanking with iron fetters. The priest has *our secret, and we are no longer free*. We fear to look up, and the downcast look of shame and ignominy is stamped on our brow.

There is no tyranny more galling and enslaving than that of the Confessional. By it a terrible dominion is established over its unhappy victims. The doctrine is no doubt very flattering to sinful man when clothed in priestly garments, for he feels himself almost a god, and is declared indeed to be a “Vicar of Christ” for this purpose.

Then again, confession is submitted to by guilty man, because he needs pardon, and has not faith to believe in the simple word of Christ, but must hear it spoken, by the audible voice of his fellow creature. Thus “the *prophets* prophesy falsely, and the *priests* bear rule by their means, and the *people* love to have it so.”

But must we confess? We must to God.

Hear the teaching of Holy Scriptures—our only infallible rule.

There is a two-fold confession.

First, there is confession to be made to God. Thus David said, “I will confess my transgression unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.”—Ps. xxxii. 5.

Again, St. John tells us that “If we confess our sins—*i.e.* to God—He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.”—1 John i. 9.

Secondly, there must be confession to our fellow man when we have offended against him.

Thus St. James says, “Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.”—James v. 16.

These two kinds of confession there must be:—confession to God, public or private, or both; and confession to man, to him whom we have offended.

Search the New Testament through, and we shall find no other than these two. We can discover no trace of secret auricular confession, nor do we find any one instance of priestly absolution exercised by Apostles or Evangelists.

The case of the Corinthians sometimes referred to—1 Cor. v. 5 and 2 Cor. ii. 10, was an instance of a church censure: the man was excommunicated by the church, and restored by the church; the Apostle, though absent, concurring.

What then is the meaning of "whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted."

The meaning is very simple. The Apostles remitted sins by the ministry of the Word, by the preaching of the Gospel, by publishing and making known the way of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ.

We have the record of their proceedings for thirty years after Christ's Ascension, during which time they preached many sermons, undertook many journeys, wrote many letters, but they never, either directly or indirectly, taught auricular confession, nor is there any instance of their practising it or absolution, whilst they did, in every possible manner, preach and teach Jesus Christ, and unfolded the method of salvation through faith in Him.

They remitted sins by the preaching of the Word, when St. Peter said:—

"To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins."

They remitted sins by the preaching of the Word, when St. Paul at Antioch proclaimed, "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this man is preached the forgiveness of sins."

And again, when he said to the Philippian jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

In a word, they remitted sins by preaching, as St. Paul "opened men's eyes and turned them from darkness to light, and the power of Satan unto God." In the same way as St. Jude tells us, believers are to "*save some* with fear," and St. James tells us that "he that *converteth* the sinner from the error of his ways, shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins."

In all these cases we are said to save, convert, reconcile, or remit, not because we can indeed do so, but only because by the preaching of the Gospel, by warning and teaching and persuading, we are instrumental in God's hands in accomplishing these mighty results.

We deny then that we must confess to a priest, save only the one priest, Christ Jesus, who ever sits, not in a confessional box, but on a throne of Grace, to receive and pardon all those who come to God by Him.

We deny that any mere human priest is the channel through which pardon comes, though he may be the teacher to point to Christ, as did John the Baptist, when he said, "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the World." He may thus be the instrument of saving our souls, and consequently of our receiving pardon and absolution, but in no other way.

We deny the right of any one to pry or search into the spiritual condition of our souls. It is a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear. Our ancestors cast it off three hundred years ago, and we refuse to submit to it again. Our watchword is,—

"Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage."

Let us not forget the teaching of our own Church on this subject in the Homily of Repentance, second part.

"It is most evident and plain that this *auricular confession* hath not the warrant of God's word.

We ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ, who being our Sovereign Bishop doth with the sacrifice of his body and blood, *offered once for ever upon the altar of the Cross*, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy and wash away the sins of all those that with true confession of the same do flee unto Him. . . . But it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance."

The Ritualists boast that they have the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, meaning by that, the power to absolve the penitent on confession. We maintain, with Jewel, that the right use and meaning of the keys has nothing whatever to do with auricular confession and priestly absolution.

"Touching the keys," saith he, "wherewith the ministers of Christ either shut or open the kingdom of Heaven, we with Chrysostom say, 'they be the knowledge of the Scriptures;' with Tertullian, we say, 'they be the interpretation of the law;' and with Eusebius we call them '*the Word of God*.' Moreover, they did not receive this authority that they should hear the private confessions of the people, and *listen to their whisperings, as the common massing priests do everywhere now-a-days*, and do it as though in that one point lay all the virtue and use of the keys; but to the end they should go, they should teach, *they should publish abroad the Gospel* . . . that the minds of godly persons might be opened with the word of God, as a door is opened with a key: contrariwise that the wicked and wilful, and such as would not believe, should be left still fast and locked up. *This take we to be the meaning of the keys*; and therefore our Saviour Jesus Christ, to reprove the negligence of the Scribes and Pharisees in teaching, did with these words rebuke them, saying, 'Wo be unto you which have taken away the key of knowledge, and have shut up the kingdom of Heaven against men.' Seeing then the key whereby the way and entry to the kingdom of God is opened unto us, is the word of the Gospel and the expounding the law and the Scriptures; *where the same word is not, there is not the key*."—(Apology. P.S. p. 381.)

Shall we then confess our sins and reveal our inmost souls and bow down our heads as a bulrush before those who, having not the word—the true Gospel—cannot possibly have the key? Never! But we will confess and pour out our hearts before Him who hath the key of David, who openeth and no man shutteth; who shutteth and no man openeth; and who from the golden mercy-seat proclaims to every penitent—

"Thy Sins be forgiven thee; Go in Peace."

THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

I. The office of the Jewish Priest* was "to offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." This was his special function. Heb. v. 1. It was his to dip his finger in the blood of the sin offering, and sprinkle it seven times before the Lord. He alone went into the Holy of Holies once every year, *but not without blood*, which he offered for himself and the people.

II. Christ is the only Priest under the Christian dispensation. (Heb. iii. 1.) He discharges all the priestly functions. Both Priest and Victim, he offered himself once, and only once.

Proof. "He *needeth not daily*, as those high priests, *to offer up sacrifice*, for this he did once when he offered up himself." (Heb. vii. 27.)

"Nor yet that he should offer himself often . . . for *then must he have often suffered*." (Heb. ix. 25, 26.)

"Christ was *once offered* to bear the sins of many." (Ibid. ix. 28.)

"We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all*," &c. &c. (Ibid. x. 10--14.)

It is evident from the foregoing that Christ as priest offered his one only offering once for all. This truth could not be expressed more plainly. He offers not now, for his *offering was connected with his suffering*. (Heb. ix. 25, 26.) If he offers he suffers; but Christ dieth no more, he suffers no more. But by virtue of that one offering once offered "he now appears in the presence of God for us."

Christ is the only Priest, his sacrifice the only offering, that offering was "finished on the cross."

III. The Apostles were not priests. *a.* They were never called by that title. The Jewish priests were so called, so was the Priest of Jupiter at Lystra. All Christians are so designated (Rev. i. 6, and v. 10), and their function a Royal Priesthood, (1 Pet. ii. 9.) But the Apostles and Christian ministers, as distinct from the people, are

* The word priest in the Prayer Book is simply a contraction of the word presbyter, or elder, as is expressed by Dr. Hook, in his Church Dictionary.

called Elders, Bishops, Deacons, Ambassadors, Preachers, Teachers, Pastors, Prophets, *but never Priests.*

IV. This is inexplicable if the priestly office be indeed their principal and most important function. In that case they are designated by every title but that which was most important and most properly belongs to them. Now, considering how natural it would have been for Jews to have used this title, the fact that *it alone is excluded* from use is decisive. *They were not priests.*

V. No sacerdotal function is ever attributed to them. The priestly office was to offer sacrifice, to shed the blood of the victim and sprinkle it on the sinner; *this they never did.* They killed no animal, they sprinkled no blood. But they went about preaching the abolition of all animal sacrifices (Heb. x. 9.) and proclaiming the all-sufficiency of the one offering and the blood once shed.

VI. All Christians are Priests to offer up the spiritual sacrifices—

a. of themselves, Rom. xii. 1.

b. of Praise, Heb. xiii. 15.

c. of good works, Phil. iv. 18.

The New Testament knows of no other priesthood **now** on earth save this.

VII. The Church of England has no sacrificing priests.

a. In her ordination service she struck out the words "*Take power to offer sacrifice,*" and substituted for them the words "Be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his holy sacraments."

b. The Church mentions no altar but "the Altar of the Cross."* Her eighty-second Canon prescribes "a decent Communion Table" for the Lord's Supper. *The word Altar was expunged* from her Prayer Book and "*Table*" substituted.

c. The Church never calls the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper a propitiatory sacrifice, but she calls *the whole Service a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.* Even this expression is found in an alternative prayer in the post communion, which need never be used.

d. The Church speaks of the "one oblation of Christ finished on the Cross," of "the offering of Christ *once made,*" and the one oblation of himself *once offered,*" words could not more plainly reject any pretended *repetition or continuation* of the offering of Christ; while the Homily warns us "lest of the memory it be made ■ sacrifice."

VIII. The Reformers rejected the idea of sacrificing priests.

* *Vide* "Homily on Repentance," Second part, quoted in the paper on "Must we Confess?" p. 4. See also Decision in the "Stone Altar Case." Faulkner v. Litchfield and Stearn. 1 Roberts, 184.

CRANMER:—"It is necessary to know the distinction and diversity of sacrifices. One kind of sacrifice there is which is called propitiatory. There is but one such sacrifice, which is the death of the Son of God. Another kind of sacrifice there is which does not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that are reconciled. It is called a sacrifice of laud, praise, and thanksgiving—the first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us; the second we ourselves offer to God by Christ."

"But all such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice of Him are his most heinous and horrible adversaries."

LATIMER:—"Stand from the altar you sacrilegious priests, for you have no authority in God's Book to *offer up* our Redeemer; and you lay people come away from forged sacrifices which the Papists do feign *only to be lords over you and to get your money*. If they had a nail driven through one of their ears every time they offer, as Christ had four driven through his hands and feet, they would soon leave offering."

JEWELL:—"No, Mr. Harding, neither we nor you can so offer Christ, nor did he ever give you commission to make such a sacrifice."

IX. Arguments advanced by Romanists in favour of Priesthood:—

1. The words, "Do this in remembrance of me," constituted the apostles priests.

Ans. This is a simple command by Christ to the apostles, and through them to all His disciples to do what He then did, viz. to break bread and eat it in remembrance of Christ's broken body, and thus to show forth, proclaim the Lord's death till He come. The word translated "Do" is one of the most common words, and never when taken merely by itself means to offer a sacrifice. In order to give it that meaning, it must always have some other word of sacrificial import joined with it, otherwise it simply means "Do."

2. The words "whosoever sins ye remit," &c. conferred priestly functions.

Ans. Not so. Christ thus empowered and commanded his apostles to remit sin by the preaching of the word. This they did, as we find recorded in Acts x. 43, xiii. 38, 39, cf. with Luke xxiv. 47, Acts xxvi. 18.

To them was committed the word of reconciliation.* They never once took on them to forgive sin as against God; though they did

* The words "whosoever sins," etc., were *never used in ordaining the clergy in any Christian Church for twelve hundred years after Christ; nor were the words "I absolve thee" ever used by the clergy until after the same time!*

inflict or remove ecclesiastical censures. (1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 10.)

3. Malachi predicted the offering of the Mass in the words, "in every place incense shall be offered to my name and a pure offering."* (Chap. i. 11.)

Ans. This prophecy refers to the spiritual incense and sacrifices of prayer and praise already mentioned (cf. Ps. cxli. 2; Rev. v. 8), and perhaps also it may have a special reference to the odour and sacrifice mentioned by S. Paul (Phil. iv. 17), viz. the incense and sacrifice of pure, self-denying contributions to the cause of God and his Gospel. Compare Mal. i. 7, 8, with this passage.

Finally, it is not true that the New Testament never speaks of Christ merely as our Priest (Heb. vii. 11, 15, 17), though it generally calls him our High Priest, because the Jewish High Priest was the more eminent type of the Messiah; and it is true that sacerdotalism and sacramentalism are unknown to the New Testament.

The Church teaches us that "*we ought to acknowledge none other priest* for deliverance from our sins *but our Saviour Jesus Christ.*" (Hom. of Repentance.)

We have no need then of earthly priests, since we have the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus. "He for us paid the ransom by his death; He for us fulfilled the law in His life, so that in Him and by Him every Christian man may be said to be a fulfiller of the law." (Hom. of Salvation, 1st part.) He is thus the only Priest and victim by whom atonement is made. Nor do we need any priest to *apply* the merits of this Sacrifice to our souls. Faith is the *one only means*, whereby we embrace the Gospel, and wash our souls in the blood of Christ.

"Herein thou needest *no other man's help*, no other sacrifice or oblation, *no sacrificing priest*, no mass, no means established by man's invention." (Hom. concerning the Sacrament.)

Seeing then that Christ has an intransmissible priesthood (Heb. vii. 24,) and that He can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and sympathize with us in all our sorrows.—"*Let us come boldly to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in every time of need.*" (Heb. iv. 16.)

* This passage is quoted in proof of the Mass by the Council of Trent. Sess. xxii. Cap. 1.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

I. Prayers for the dead are intimately connected with the doctrine of Purgatory; for if in Heaven it is difficult to see what need a soul can have for our prayers; if in Hell they can be of no use. It is accordingly maintained by Dr. Littledale "that even the best and holiest men leave this world bearing the *stains of sin* and error which must be cleansed *somewhere* before they can be fitted for heaven." This is Purgatory.

II. Our Church declares Purgatory to be "a fond thing vainly invented and founded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." Purgatory is founded on a virtual denial of the sufficiency of the atonement, and of the efficacy of "the blood of Christ which cleanseth from all sin;" and it leads directly to the Romish doctrine of the Mass which the Church denounces as "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit."

III. Prayers for the dead are *unscriptural*.

a. The word of God is our perfect rule of faith and practice. All will worship is forbidden; so is teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. To a thousand specious arguments in favour of the practice we have one all-conclusive answer:—*It is not warranted by Scripture.*

b. No patriarch, prophet, apostle, or saint mentioned in Scripture ever offered up a prayer for the dead. To say that they did so is a mere assertion. We challenge proof. Prayer for the dead is nowhere enjoined or suggested. The Bible contains 66 books written by some 30 different men on every possible religious subject, but it contains not one single sentence in favour of praying for the dead.

IV. Prayers for the dead are contrary to the direct teaching of the New Testament.

a. The soul of Lazarus went straight to Abraham's bosom, where he was comforted; the soul of the rich man to hell where he was tormented. The soul of the penitent thief went straight to Paradise with Christ.

b. St. Paul teaches that to *be absent from the body* is not to be in Purgatory or any place requiring our prayers, but *present with the Lord*: to depart is to be *with Christ*, to die is, not suffering hereafter, *but gain*.

c. St. John declares that those who die in the Lord rest and are blessed. But they are neither blest nor do they rest if, as Dr. Littledale says, they are suffering temporary punishment after death.

V. Prayers for the dead are rejected by our Prayer Book.

a. In the semi-reformed Book of 1549 the practice was taught, in that of 1552 it was rejected. Not only was the prayer *struck out* of that for "the whole state of Christ's Church," but the words "*militant here on earth*" were added to the title; thus excluding prayers for the dead, and instead thereof we thank God for all those departed this life in his faith and fear.

b. The Burial Service in 1549 contained the following:—

"Grant unto this thy servant that the sins which he hath committed in this world be not imputed to him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the regions of light."

In 1552 this was *struck out*, and the souls of the faithful are declared to be "with the Lord *in joy and felicity*." Thanks are therefore offered up for the deliverance of our brother from the miseries of this world, and we pray that God would hasten his kingdom so that we, *with* (not *and*) all those who are departed in the true faith of his holy name may have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul in his glorious kingdom. *We pray for ourselves, we give thanks for the dead.*

VI. Prayers for the dead are condemned by the Homilies:

"Now to entreat of that question, Whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world or no? Wherein, if we will cleave only unto the word of God, then must we needs grant, that we have no commandment so to do. For the Scripture doth acknowledge *but two places after this life*: the one proper to the elect and blessed of God, the other to the reprobate and damned souls; as may be well gathered by the parable of Lazarus and the rich man:
* * * Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away

the gross error of purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more, that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers: but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that *the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven, or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption.*"

Here the Church teaches:—

1. "There are but two places after this life."
2. The dead are *not at all holpen by our prayers.*
3. "The soul goes straight either to heaven or hell."
4. "In heaven the soul needs no prayers; in hell it is without redemption."

VII. Prayers for the dead are condemned by the Reformers.

Jewell.—"Praying for the dead is superstitious and without warrant of God's word." (Vol. ii. p. 743. P. S.)

Whitgift in answer to Cartwright.—"We pray not for our brother and others that be departed in the true faith, *but we pray for ourselves*, that we may have our perfect consummation, &c. as we are sure those shall who die in his true faith. *It is a manifest untruth to maintain that we pray for the dead.*" (Vol. iii. p. 364. P. S.)

Bp. Cooper.—"The offering for the dead in the ancient Church was no more than an offering or thanksgiving for their salvation." (p. 96. P. S.)

Abp. Usher.—"Prayer is abused when we pray for such things as God hath made no promise of, *as when men pray for souls departed.*" (p. 277.)

VIII. Supposed arguments in favour of prayers for the dead.

1. St. Paul prayed for Onesiphorus. (2 Tim. i. 18.) The inference being, it is said, that he was dead.

Ans. This inference is entirely gratuitous. He may have been absent from his family. This is too weak a foundation for a doctrine which virtually contravenes the whole tenor of Scripture.

2. Judas Maccabæus offered a sacrifice for the souls of some idolators who fell in battle, and declared it was a wholesome thought to pray for the dead.

Ans. What then? Jeroboam set up golden calves in Bethel and Dan for the people to worship. Are we to follow his example? Yet he had as much authority for the one as Judas Maccabæus for the other.

3. The early Christians prayed for the dead.

Ans. Very likely. Many of them were converts from Paganism, and so naturally enough corrupted the purity of the Gospel with notions derived from their former state. They had been in the habit of offering sacrifices for their dead, and clung to a notion so congenial to corrupt human nature. Besides, we know that the mystery of iniquity began to work in the Apostles' days. There is reason however to believe that many of them only intended a sacrifice of thanksgiving, for they offered for patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and even for the Virgin Mary herself.

4. The Communion of Saints implies prayers for the dead.

Ans. It implies nothing of the sort, but only the fellowship which the whole family of Christ have in him. (1 John i. 3; Heb. xii. 22, 23.)

Protestant Churchmen! Prayers for the dead are connected with some of the worst errors of Rome. Already the "Holy sacrifice" is offered by the Ritualists for the souls of the departed, and declared to be propitiatory for the sins of the living and the dead. A door is thus thrown open to the worst abuses of the Mass; and the solemn warning of St. Peter is needed against those false teachers, "who through covetousness *with feigned words* make merchandise" of the souls of men. (2 Pet. ii. 3.) The love of filthy lucre and sacerdotal power is at the bottom of this doctrine; well did Cranmer say: "they have *devised* a purgatory to torment souls after this life; and oblation of masses said by the priests to deliver them."

Prayer for the dead is one of the natural instincts of corrupt human nature. For man feels that he is not fit for the presence of God, and yet he shrinks from the dreadful idea of being banished for ever to endless misery. The notion, therefore, that there is a middle place, or state, where the dead can be helped by the suffrages of the living, is readily embraced. The wish is father to the thought, and hence its wide and ready acceptance by the unconverted. The Gospel, however, knows nothing of it. Washed in the blood of Christ by a living faith; clothed with the imputed robe of His spotless righteousness, and sanctified by His Holy Spirit, the believer is assured of an immediate entrance into a blissful immortality.

THE TEACHING OF THE RITUALISTS NOT THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Ritualists have two devices which it is well to notice.

First, they represent themselves as Catholics, and say they are eager to revive the traditions and worship of the Primitive Church. This representation is contrary to the fact. The Church of England took that course at her Reformation; all that was pure, primitive, and Catholic, both in worship, faith, and order, she retained. She cast off only the fictions, idolatry, and error by which Roman Priestcraft and Italian ambition had disfigured the Apostolic faith.

But the Reformation and the work of our Reformed Church is denounced by Ritualists as mutilated, Antichristian, and a pestilent heresy, while, in fact, the Ritualists are merely reintroducing the ceremonies and dogmas which our fathers cast off as idolatrous and superstitious. When therefore they call themselves Catholics, they mean Romanists.

Their second device, when they meet their countrymen, is to disguise and cloke their opinions.

They appeal to that just sentiment which prevails, the desire to reclaim and instruct the masses. They represent themselves as devoted to this duty. Whereas, when you watch their acts and visit their churches, you find them doing the work of Roman priests, endeavouring by appeals to remorse, by demands for confession, by offers of absolution, by sacrifices of masses, by urging of prayers to Saints and the Virgin, by appeals to the senses, music, incense, shows and dresses, to allure to Church the frivolous, careless, and dissipated. The result of this is, what it is in all European countries where Rome prevails, to bring power, repute, and gifts to the priest; to leave unchanged the vices and appetites of the people.

Ritualism then is in its faith and forms Romanism; and, in order not to misrepresent it, we shall take its own organs to describe its practices, and learn its words and ways from its tracts, magazines, catechisms, manuals of devotion, and the newspapers, which the Ritualists publish.

1. *They declare that the doctrine of Rome and England is the same,* they attend the Roman mass,† and recommend others to do the same,‡ and they pray for union with the corrupt Church of Rome.§*

* "The breach between us and Rome is not so wide as is commonly thought."
—*Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon*, p. 207.

"What I have said to the Gallican [*i.e.* Romish] Bishops, and what they have clearly understood, is this, 'that I believe the Council of Trent, whatever its look may be, and our Articles, whatever their look may be, each could be so explained as to be reconcilable one with the other.'"*—Speech by Dr. Pusey, at the Annual Meeting of the English Church Union, 1866. See E. C. U. Circular, for July, 1866, p. 197.*

"None but those who have reduced ignorance to a system, now deny that the differences between the authoritative documents of Rome and England are infinitesimal—that the priesthood is the same, the Liturgy virtually the same, and the doctrine the same."*—Church Times, June 18, 1869.*

† "We have attended mass in a hundred great cities of the continent, and found out that there is not of necessity an idol in every foreign Church; but that it is very possible to worship with a Roman priest, and not only to receive no harm, but some good."*—Rev. W. J. E. Bennett's Essay on "Some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833," in the Church and the World, p. 19. 1867.*

‡ "If the traveller should assist at Protestant worship, he is aiding and abetting that false doctrine, heresy, and schism from which he prays in the Litany to be delivered. If he does go to the Anglican chapel, he is nevertheless bound to be present at an early Mass in the Roman parish church."*—Church News, July 7, 1869.*

§ "It is the distinct duty of all who pray for the peace of Jerusalem to repudiate foreign Lutheranism, Calvinism, &c., and to do their utmost to show that the English Church, of which they are members, is really one with the Church of Rome in faith, orders, and sacraments; whilst the Protestant bodies are branches cut off from the True Vine, of which the Roman and Anglican and Eastern Communions are living boughs."*—Church News, July 7, 1869.*

"We had been chosen by God to be the colonists of all newly discovered lands, and we stood, like Aaron, between the living and the dead—between the living Church and the dead and decaying forms of a corrupt Protestantism. We were bound to come forward with our message to both—to the living, that they be not high-minded, but fear; to the dead, that they arise and return to the pure bosom of their mother the Catholic Church."*—From Notice of Sermon by Rev. Dr. Littledale on the Anniversary of the A. P. U. C. in the Church Times, Sept. 10, 1869.*

2. *They revile Protestantism. They call it heresy,* a pest,† a cancer,‡ a monstrous figment,§ and they vilify the Reformation and the Reformers|| in terms equally coarse,¶ and yet they quietly remain in incumbencies and curacies within the Church of the Reformation.*

* A writer in *The Church and the World* (Ed. 1866, p. 237) says, "Our place is appointed us among Protestants, and in a communion deeply tainted in its practical system by Protestant heresy; but our duty is the expulsion of the evil, and not flight from it."

"They (the ministers) carry on a school, and are indefatigable in visiting the poor, and in infusing into the veins of an ignorant and unsuspicious populace the poison of Protestant heresy." † "Pest of Protestantism."*—Church News, May 5th, 1869.*

‡ "But we should much prefer seeing attention centred on theological matters and questions of discipline, and extirpating that ulcerous cancer of Protestantism which must be fatal, sooner or later, to any Church that does not use moral steel and fire upon it."*—Church Times, Sept. 3, 1869.*

§ "By way of protest against the monstrous figment of Protestantism."*—Ibid.*

"We are bound to correct one of the speakers [at the Islington Clerical Meeting] who remarked that the Tractarian School, whatever its good points may be, loses sight of the distinctive doctrines of the Reformation. We do not lose sight of them at all. We are busy in hunting them down, and have no intention of foregoing the chase till we have extirpated them. That is plain speaking enough, we trust."*—Church Times, Jan. 28th, 1870.*

¶ "Anathema to the Principles of Protestantism."*—Palmer's Letter to Golightly,*

¶ Dr. Littledale, in his *Lecture on Innovations*, calls the Reformers a set of miscreants and utterly unredeemed villains.

3. They propose to abandon, and labour for the abolition of, the xxxix Articles of Religion,* which “contain the true doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God’s Word.”

* “First of all come the xxxix Articles, those Protestant Articles, tacked on to a Catholic Liturgy, those forty-stripes-save-one, as some have called them, laid on the back of the Anglican priesthood.—How are they to be got over?”—*Essay by Rev. L. Blenkinsopp on “Reunion of the Church,” in the Church and the World.* 1866, p. 202.

See proposal of Dr. Pusey that the Universities should abandon subscription to the xxxix Articles as the practical qualification for orthodox Church of England Protestant teaching, in *Letter to the President of the Wesleyan Conference*, 1868.

“It will soon become the duty of Churchmen to labour actively for the abolition of the Articles, which have long ago done their work and are really of extremely little use now, discrediting us (as they do) in the eyes of foreign Catholics.”—*Church News*, July 29, 1868.

“We have never seen the use of retaining the Thirty-nine Articles at all.”—*Church Times*, March 12th, 1869.

“The abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles, the adoption of Edward VI. First Communion Office, . . . would win for the Disestablished Church the respect of Christendom.”—*Church Times*, Sep. 3rd. 1869.

4. They hold with the Church of Rome that there are seven Sacraments,* whereas our xxvth Article declares that there are two Sacraments ordained of Christ in the Gospel—Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

* See Article on “The Seven Sacraments,” in *Tracts for the Day*, edited by Rev. O. Shipley.

In the *Prayer Book for the Young, or Complete Guide to Public and Private Devotion for youthful members of the English Church*, “Confirmation,” “Confession,” “Visitation of the Sick,” “Holy Orders” and “Matrimony” are enumerated among the Sacraments, p. 10.

Rev. Orby Shipley states in his “*Sermons on Sin*,” that “there are seven Sacraments and personal extensions of the incarnation of God”—“Baptism,” “Confirmation,” “Eucharist,” “Marriage,” “Orders,” “Extreme Unction,” “Penance.” And he adds, “The seventh and last sacramental extension of the Incarnation of our God, I need not tell you, my brethren, in theological language, is termed the ‘Sacrament of Penance.’”—pp. 43 to 50.

5. They pray to the Virgin Mary, and elevate her to a throne in heaven;* and our Church declares such adoration to be superstitious and idolatrous.

* “Blessed Mary, Mother of God, ever Virgin, pray for us.”—*Litany of the Blessed Virgin, in Invocation of Saints and Angels*, by Rev. O. Shipley, p. 66.

“Hail Queen of heaven; hail Mistress of the Angels, hail root, hail gate, wherefrom the light of the world is sprung! Rejoice, O Glorious Virgin, preeminently fair, and very lovely, hail! Mayst thou pray Christ for us.”—*Monastic Breviary*, used at Rev. J. L. Lyne’s Monastery at Laleham, Convent at London, &c. p. 80.

See *The Femall Glory*, edited by Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A., 1869.

6. They pray to saints and invoke their intercession.* Our Church terms such prayers “repugnant to the Word of God.” (Art. xxii.) St. Paul says there is “one Mediator between God and man.”—1 Tim. ii. 5.

* “O holy Michael, Prince of the Heavenly Host pray for us.” “O Raphael, pray for us.”—*Invocation of Saints and Angels*, edited by Rev. O. Shipley, pp. 45, 46.

“Of our patron saint. Most Holy Confessor of the Lord () mayst thou intercede to Christ for us.”—*Little Office Book*, p. 17.

“I pray that Blessed Mary, ever a Virgin, Blessed Michael the Archangel, Blessed John Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, our Blessed Father Benedict, all the Saints (and you, my brothers), may pray for me to the Lord our God.”—*Monastic Breviary*, used at Rev. J. L. Lyne’s Monastery at Laleham, &c., p. 7.

7. *They set up images of the Virgin and of the saints ; and introduce into their churches the Romish pictures of ' the Twelve Stations of the Cross,' and publish forms of prayer to be said at each Station,* as in the Roman Catholic Church ; whereas our Church warns us that images " if they be publicly suffered in churches will lead to idolatry." (Art. xxxv, and Homily against Peril of Idolatry.)*

* See Decorations in Ritualistic Churches—St. Michael's and All Angels, Shore-ditch, and others.

* See the ' Way of the Cross' in the Treasury of Devotion, pp. 191 to 200.

8. *They pervert the Communion Table into an Altar, the Communion into a Mass, and the Clergyman into a sacrificing Priest, who elevates material elements incorporating the Deity, and directe these to be adored by the worshipper with genuflections and prostration ;* whereas our Church declares that the Mass " overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament" (Art. xxviii), and that such worship is " idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians." (Communion Service.)*

* " This prayer we say (to use the word common to us all) in the *Mass which we now offer in many places daily on our altars.*"—Rev. W. J. E. Bennett's *Essay. " Some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833 " in the Church and the World*, p. 19. 1867.

" Grant that the Sacrifice, which I a miserable sinner have offered before Thy Divine Majesty, may be acceptable unto Thee, and through thy mercy may be a propitiation for me, and all for whom I have offered It."—*Priest's Prayer Book*, p. 13.

Evidence before the Royal Ritual Commission. *Question* 2608.—Do you consider yourself a Sacrificing Priest ? Answer by Rev. W. J. E. Bennett.—" Yes."

" THE PRIEST AT THE ALTAR IS VIRTUALLY CHRIST HIMSELF."—*Catechism of Theology*, p. 58.

" Q.—Is not the Holy Eucharist also a Sacrifice ?—A.—Yes."—*Catechism*, p. 35. Oxford. 1863.

" May the Lord receive this Sacrifice, etc."—*Little Prayer Book*, p. 18.

" Now kneel upright, your hands clasped upon your breast ; follow the Priest in silent awe, for Jesus thy God is very nigh thee. He is about to descend upon the altar, surrounded by the Fire of the Holy Ghost, and attended by the angels. At the Consecration and Elevation prostrate yourself to the dust and say, ' Hail Body of my God—Hail Body of my Redeemer—I adore—I adore—I adore thee.'"—*Manual of Devotions and Directions for Members of the Church of England, intended especially for the Young.*

9. *They enjoin the reservation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, whereas our xxviiiith Article says :—" The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.*

" Celebration in private rooms should be avoided as much as possible. For this purpose it is well to have the Blessed Sacrament reserved in the church (where this may be done), but especially in collegiate and monastic chapels, where it should always be reserved. The priest should, on due notice being given, carry it from thence in the pyx (in both kinds of course), to the sick man's house. . . . The priest carries the blessed Sacrament in a monstrance (as described in appendix for reservation in both kinds), or he will convey it in the chalice, the Holy Body being placed previously therein by him, soaked in a few drops of the precious Blood, the chalice being covered with a white veil, and burse, with a corporal folded inside."—*The Ritual of the Anglican Clergy*, p. 23.

10. *They pray for the souls of the Dead, and they declare their belief in Purgatory, and in the power of the priest to relieve from its penalties* ;* whereas our Church declares purgatory to be “a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” (Art. xxii.)

* “What seems to be agreed upon is :—That, meantime, the souls of those persons are benefited by the Prayers and Offerings of the Church, and by Alms given in their behalf, that those who have not died beyond the pale of salvation receive mitigation of their sufferings and ultimate release ; and that, possibly, those who are lost also gain a mitigation of their sufferings, which mitigation may last through Eternity.”—*Article on Purgatory in Tracts for the Day*, edited by Rev. O. Shipley, p. 29.

“We beseech thee, O Lord God Almighty, for the souls of the faithful departed, etc.”—*Altar Manual*, edited by a Committee of Clergy, p. 34.

“The souls of the departed thus abiding in their place of rest may be the subjects of prayer to those who are still alive upon the earth,” because “the souls that are departed are not in their perfection.”—*Church's Broken Unity*, by Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, p. 122.

“Accept this Sacrifice, which, to the Honour of thy Name, we have offered for the faithful, both living and departed, and for all our sins and offences.”—*Altar Manl.* p. 36.

“The state of the departed souls, whether in pain or pleasure, is not yet final. The truth is that they are in custody, easy or harsh, awaiting Trial.”

“The best and holiest men (and much more the average believers) leave this world bearing the stains of earthly sin and error, which must be cleansed *somewhere* before they can be fitted for heaven.”—*Prayers for the Dead*, by Rev. Dr. Littledale, p. 2.

See Dr. Pusey's Address, headed, “The prayers for departed Companions of the Society of the Love of Jesus.”—p. 127, 8.

Also notices at the doors of Ritualistic Churches, “Of your Charity pray for —,” and then follow the names of persons sick and *dead*.

11. *They omit the Prayers for the Queen, the Royal Family and Parliament*,* and are agitating for a separation of Church and State.†

* In Ritualistic Churches the ‘State Prayers’ are generally omitted.

“There does not seem to be any great reason for retaining the prayer for the Queen, bearing in mind the very full and emphatic terms in which her Majesty is mentioned in the Canon. Most people, we suspect, would be exceedingly glad if this prayer, as well as the Comfortable Words and the Addresses were dropped.”—*Church Times*, Jan. 20, 1866.

† “I referred to an extreme faction in the Church of very modern date that does not conceal its ambition to destroy the connection between Church and State.”—*Letter from the late Premier to Rev. A. Baker*, dated 9th April, 1868.

See Rev. W. J. E. Bennett's Sermon at Bristol, on May 2, 1869, advocating the separation of Church and State, and speaking of their connection as an adulterous love between the kingdom of the world and the kingdom of God.—*Ch. Times*, May 7, '69.

12. *They also introduce the Romish practices of Extreme Unction,—Incensing persons and things,—Substituting wafers for bread at the Communion Service,—Using Holy Water,—Consecrating and censuring Palm branches on Palm Sunday,—Consecrating ashes, and rubbing them on persons' foreheads on Ash Wednesday,—Censing candles and sprinkling them with Holy Water on Candlemas day.*

See Essay on “Unction of the Sick” in *Tracts for the Day*, edited by Rev. O. Shipley, where the writer speaks of “the Sacrament of Unction,” p. 342, and adds (p. 359) : “The principal effect then of Unction is the removal of the relics of Sin ; its consequential effect, the remission of the guilt of any Sin it may find in the soul.”

“The recognized consecration of chrism and holy oil for various rites cannot be much longer postponed. It will certainly come in somehow.”—*Dr. Littledale's Letter to the Archbishop on “Catholic Revision,”* p. 28.

Liturgy of Church of Sarum dedicated by permission to Bp. of Salisbury.

13. *They advocate the Procession and Veneration of Relics.*

See instructions for Procession and Veneration of Relics in *Oratory Worship*.

"It is well, when the relics are to be exposed, to erect a resting-place for them just within the chancel, or in some place calculated to facilitate the veneration of the faithful." p. 32.

Then follow details of the service, and it concludes by saying, "After the *Te Deum* the officiant and his ministers should proceed to the chancel gates, and there hold the inner relic-case to be kissed by the faithful, wiping the glass after each osculation with a piece of cotton wool."—p. 34.

14. *They encourage and enjoin habitual auricular confession to a priest, and seek to restore Judicial Absolution by a Priest, and the Romish Sacrament of Penance,** whereas our Church says, "to maintain their auricular confession withal they are greatly deceived themselves and do shamefully deceive others." "It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not the warrant of God's word."—Second part of Homily on Repentance.

* Mr. Dodsworth, writing to Dr. Pusey, eighteen years ago, says;—"Both by precept and example you have been amongst the most earnest to maintain Catholic principles. By your constant and common practice of administering the Sacrament of Penance; by encouraging everywhere, if not enjoining, auricular confession, and giving special priestly absolution," &c.

Mr. Maskell, addressing Dr. Pusey about the same time, wrote, "He (Mr. Dodsworth) knew that you have done more than encouraged Confession in very many cases: that you have warned people of the danger of deferring it, have insisted on it as the only remedy, have pointed out the inevitable dangers of the neglect of it, and have promised the highest blessings in the observance, until you had brought penitents in fear and trembling upon their knees before you."

Dr. Pusey, in a Letter to the *Times*, Nov. 29th, 1866, says: "During the twenty-eight years in which I have received Confession, I never had once to refuse absolution."

In the "*Ordinance of Confession*" the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield, has given very minute directions both to penitent and confessor. He also says that the priest when he hears confessions, should wear his robes of office; and then at p. 96 he speaks thus about absolution:—

"The giving Absolution is not a matter of course, but is dependent on the judgment of the priest. He has power to retain as well as remit sins—to give absolution or refuse it. Awful thought!"

"Listen carefully to all the Priest says to you, be sure to remember the penance he gives you, and receive the Absolution thankfully."—*Little Prayer Book*, p. 33.

"The essential form of Absolution is not to be put forth after the manner of a prayer, but as by authority, being a judicial act."—*The Priest in Absolution*, p. 50.

"Confession is one of the lesser Sacraments, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, by means of which those sins which we commit after Baptism are forgiven," &c.—*Prayer Book for the Young*, p. 71.

15. *They are restoring Monasteries and Convents.*

The Rev. J. L. Lyne (Father Ignatius) has established a Monastery at Laleham, ■ Convent of Sisters of St. Benedict in London; and there are convents of Benedictines in London, Newcastle, and Norwich, and a Priory of Benedictine nuns at Feltham.

"The Rev. R. M. Benson, M.A., Incumbent of St. John the Evangelist, Oxford, and a prominent member of the High Church party (Ritualistic?) in that city, has been holding a 'Retreat' at his *Monastery* in Marston-street, Oxford, which has been attended by a large number of clergymen from all parts of the United Kingdom. During its continuance the brethren, as they are called, give themselves up to fasting and prayer, maintaining the strictest silence and reserve. The Services in the chapel attached to the *Monastery* are incessant, the members of the *Brotherhood* appearing to spend the whole of their time between prayers in the chapel and meditations in their cells. The whole of the brethren are clothed in long black cassocks, confined at the waist by a cord, and wear large black felt hats."—*Morning Advertiser*, Oct. 1869.

See account of service at what is called the Feltham Nunnery, quoted in the *Guardian*, September 9th, 1868, in which it is stated that—

"The Priest commenced with the Communion Service of the Church of England, the young lady who was to receive the veil was dressed as a bride. The novice's habit, scapular, girdle, and sandals, wimple and cloak, were solemnly blessed, her long black hair was all cut off, her white dress changed for a Benedictine frock, the white veil solemnly blessed and incensed, and then placed over her head, and she took the three vows for one year. The nuns are entirely enclosed, never go out, only see visitors at a grating in the Convent parlour, and then their faces are covered, and they obey the strict Benedictine rule."

In the same account it is stated that in a previous week a nun took the black veil in the house with ceremonies still more striking and solemn.

16. *They recommend the celibacy of Priests.*

"All Catholics who seriously desire the spiritual well-being of our Church ought earnestly to long to see some such discipline as that which prevails in the Holy Eastern Church established among ourselves—to have some stringent law or Canon enacted making the reception of at least Priest's Orders a bar to subsequent marriage on pain of perpetual irregularity."—*Church News*, Oct. 13th, 1869.

The Rev. W. Humphrey in an essay, "The Three Vows" in *The Church and the World*, enjoins the necessity of the three vows of Chastity, Obedience, and Poverty, and says, "Perpetual continence is requisite in order to the perfection of Religion."—p. 517.

"We are perfectly convinced that until the celibate life for men, and especially for priests, is very widely recognized and practised among us, we shall be lacking in an important feature necessary to the perfection of a Christian Church."—*Church News*, April 7th, 1869.

17. *They deny the sole authority of God's Word. For its supremacy, they substitute the traditions of the dark ages, introduced by an ambitious priesthood, to enrich and aggrandize their order.**

With a clear note, our Church rebukes these views, declaring that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation" (Art. vi.); and that "while each Church has the right and the power to decree ceremonies"—(Art. xx.)—"it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written;" and "whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." (Art. vi.)

* "If all the Bibles in the world could be gathered together to-morrow into one place and cast into the sea, I see nothing to hinder the Christian mission spreading in the world, in the same way as it spread between the years 33 and 80 A.D. (or whatever date may be assigned for the completion of the New Testament Canon). Neither, to take a practical case, which involves no such extravagant hypothesis, do I think that a Christian Priest, sent to a heathen land to win converts to the Faith, has any need to take a Bible with him, or any call to use it with the heathen previous to their baptism, or in any sense to treat it as a necessary element in the work of conviction."—*Kiss of Peace*. Sequel, p. 59.

"In the sense in which it is commonly understood at this day, Scripture, it is plain, is not, on Anglican principles, the Rule of Faith."—*Tracts for the Times*, No. 90, p. 11, republished with Preface by Dr. Pusey, 1865.

"I most firmly believe, O my God, whatever thy Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches."—*Little Prayer Book*, pp. 13, 14.

"There are a great many persons who are under the impression that the Bible is intended to teach us our religion. Let me say most distinctly and definitely that this is a thorough mistake."—*An Open Bible*. Lecture by Rev. J. E. Vaux, p. 18.

"If we would decide between conflicting opinions on fundamental doctrines, we must appeal to the Universal Church. Her voice will tell us 'What is Truth.'"—*Ib.* p. 17.

"The Church is not the Church of the Bible, but the Bible is the Book of the Church."—*Ibid.* p. 15.

18. *Even on the Primacy of the Pope, which by acts of Parliament and by the Order of our Reformed Church was rejected, these men are now approaching the Papacy with their entreaties. They set up Associations to promote reunion with Rome: they desecrate public worship by prayers for it; they hail the Papal Council; they declare the identity of our Articles with the Papal Creed; and the language, in which some of their leaders have lately expressed themselves, leaves no doubt as to their design. In St. Alban's, Holborn, Dr. Little-dale, accompanied by three other Priests, asked all present to pray*

"That Pentecostal fires might descend upon that great Council which was about to assemble under the chief Bishop of the Church, so that some of the scandals of the last 300 years might be removed."

One of their organs expressed plainly the sentiments of the party :

"The cry of the earnest and devout in our Communion to the successor of St. Peter is 'Come over and help us.' Will he stop his ears and beat back the hands stretched towards him, or will he advance half way and fall on our neck and kiss us? We are quite content to allow that we have been, as a Church, separate, degraded by the State to keep swine, and famished on the husks it has cast to us, but we do not forget that we are sons."—Church News, Sept. 15, 1869.

We cannot wonder that in a Roman Catholic newspaper, a letter from an Ecclesiastic of high position is given, which states :—

"It is notably impossible for the Holy Father and the Council to ignore the reunion with the Holy See expressed by so many pious Anglicans." From information "received from Catholics in England, from Archbishop Manning downwards,"—"the present spirit of the more advanced Anglicans is all that could be desired."—Weekly Register, Sept. 4.

Therefore, it is no exaggeration to describe the Ritualistic party as Romanists, who have reached already with bold advance the worst errors and idolatries of the Church of Rome.

The conspiracy now is organized, its practice open, its purpose avowed. To unprotestantize our Church and to overthrow our reformed faith is their deliberate and unconcealed design. Nor is the evil or the danger small; in some cases the laity have been corrupted by their teaching and have imbibed Romish errors, but the great majority of our laity are shocked and startled to find such heresies suffered within our Church, and they ask, with wonder and impatience, why is nothing done? what are the heads of our Church doing?

One conclusion is, that the faithful members of our Protestant Church must look for a remedy, under God, not to others but to themselves.

Union is as necessary as Action. If the faithful members of our Church, are, through God's blessing, permitted to resist the two great dangers of Ritualistic and Romish superstition on the one hand, and Unbelief on the other, they must learn to think, to deliberate and act together, but above all to be earnest in prayer. This course was pursued by the members of the early Church; and ended by God's blessing in harmonious agreement. This should be our course. That which we must look for, which alone will serve us, is the cordial union of Clergy and Laity, and their united prayer to Him who ordereth all things according to his good pleasure.

EVENING COMMUNION.

BY THE REV. R. P. BLAKENEY, D.D.

THE celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Evening is now very general in our towns and populous places ; its convenience can not be denied, and multitudes are grateful for the opportunity which they enjoy. As there are some, however, who object on principle to Evening Communion, we now offer a few observations on the subject.

FIRST, THE HOLY COMMUNION WAS INSTITUTED IN THE EVENING, AND AT THE PASCHAL FEAST. It is almost unnecessary to quote the words of the Evangelist—"Now when *Even* was come, he "sat down with the twelve," Matt. xxvi. 20. Jesus forewarned his disciples of his betrayal, and the Evangelist proceeds:—"And as "they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it and brake it, and "gave it to the disciples and said, Take, eat, this is my body. And he "took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink "ye all of it." 26, 27. No one has ever questioned that it was while they were eating, or as it is in the Douay version—"whilst they were "at supper," that Jesus instituted this Sacrament.

Alford observes:—"It is impossible to assign to this event its precise place." On the words, "while they were eating," he says:—"During the meal—as distinguished from the distribution of the cup "which was after it," in loco. It is remarkable that the Communion was not a service distinct from the Paschal Feast, but a *part* of it, and that the continuation and completion of the meal intervened between the administration of the sacramental bread and that of the sacramental wine. The complete dissimilarity existing between the Lord's celebration of this ordinance, and the Mass, is obvious! A *feast*, and not a *fast* preceded the reception of the emblems, or, to speak more accurately, the reception of the Sacrament formed a constituent part of the meal. Here was Evening Communion, and that with feasting not fasting.

SECONDLY, APOSTOLIC PRACTICE WAS CONFORMABLE TO THE MODEL GIVEN IN THE NIGHT THAT JESUS WAS BETRAYED.

The Acts, and Epistles afford abundant proof of this. We refer to Acts ii. 46, xx. 7; 1 Cor. xi. 20—22; Jude, 12.

On these portions, we now give the expositions of commentators of opposite schools who, however, in the main, agree on this point.

Thorndike is a favourite authority amongst the Ritualists and their supporters. Archdeacon Denison lately offered to Convocation, in justification of the position of the Ritualists, quotations from his works. But let us now see what Thorndike, as an expositor of Scripture, states on this subject. He says:—"The Scripture teaches "us that the whole Church continued in the service of God, so that "out of the common stock of the Church, common entertainment "was provided for the rich and poor, *at which entertainment the "Sacrament of the Eucharist was celebrated* as it was instituted by "our Lord at his last Supper. This is what is called breaking of "bread. Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 7; and by the Apostle, 1 Cor. xi. 20, "the supper of the Lord,' not meaning thereby the Sacrament of "the Eucharist, but their *common entertainment* at which this Sacra- "ment was celebrated, which is therefore truly called the sacrament "of the Lord's Supper, not the supper of the Lord, for you see the "apostle complains that because the rich and the poor supped not "together, therefore they did not celebrate the supper of the Lord."—*Works*, p. 540, vol. i. part 2, Anglo-Cath. Library.

We now appeal to one of an extremely opposite school, namely, to Dean Stanley, who agrees on this point with Thorndike.

He observes on Acts ii. 42, in reference to the Communion:—"That it was in some manner either directly connected with, or part "of a *common daily meal*. The words 'daily' (καθ' ἡμέραν) 'in their "private homes' (κατ' οἶκον), 'partook of their food' (μετελάμβανον τροφῆς) conjointly taken, admit of no other interpretation. With "these indications agree all other passages which mention it. In "Acts xx. 7, we read that the disciples came together at Troas on "the first day of the week to break bread."—*On the Corinth.* London, 1865.

Stanley argues that "the lateness of the hour from evening to "midnight, and from midnight till the break of day; the long com- "versation (ὁμιλήσας) not having yet acquired its historical sense "of preaching; the taking of nourishment for the journey, which is "immediately connected with the mention of the apostle's departure, "κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον καὶ γευσάμενος οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν where γευσάμενος "implies not merely eaten, but made a meal."—*Ibid.*

We now quote Olshausen, a German Divine, more particularly on 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21. "When ye come, therefore, together into one "place; this is not to eat the Lord's supper" (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον). "For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper. "(ἰδίον δεῖπνον.) And one is hungry, and another is drunken." He says:—"According to custom among the ancient Christians, *the "celebration of the love feast was regularly connected with that of "the holy communion*, so that the whole ceremony formed a strict "commemoration of our Lord's Passover Feast. Together they are "received as one operation, and called δεῖπνον κυριακόν. All believers

“as members of a single God’s family, ate and drank together
“earthly and divine food, in witness of their inward unity for time
“and eternity.”—*Bib. Com. on Corinth.* p. 180, *Edinburgh*, 1851.

We give another authority from another denomination.

The Douay, *Roman Catholic*, version contains the following note—
“*The Lord’s Supper*. So the Apostle here calls the *charity feasts*
“(*sic*) observed by the primitive Christians, and reprehends the
“abuses of the Corinthians on these occasions: which were the more
“criminal because *these feasts were accompanied with the celebrating*
“*the Eucharistic sacrifice and sacrament*.” *Belfast*, 1852.

The same Bible thus renders Jude, 12. “These are spots in their
“*banquets*,” of which the Greek is ἐν ταῖς ἀνάγκαις, rendered in our
version—“In your feasts of charity” (love).

It was at these feasts, which were accompanied by the Lord’s
supper, that the Corinthians were guilty of the excesses to which the
Apostle refers. The rich and the poor were accustomed to sit together
at a common table to partake of food provided by the former, which
exhibited the love which Christians bore to each other, but, in this
instance, they consumed the supper without regard to the poorer
brethren, and by their excesses, and want of love, were unworthy
partakers of the accompanying sacrament. The Apostle does not
forbid the feast, but says:—“Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come
“together to eat, tarry one for another.” ver. 33.

THIRDLY, IT IS CLEAR THAT THE AGAPE OR LOVE FEAST, AS
ASSOCIATED WITH THE LORD’S SUPPER, LINGERED IN THE CHURCH
LONG AFTER THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

Neander having observed that “after the example of the Jewish
Passover and the original institution, the Lord’s supper was at first
united with a social meal,” proceeds to refer to the changes which
time, that great innovator, had made in this matter. The *agape* at
length was separated from the communion—a fact to which Neander
refers as follows:—“This separation was occasioned partly by similar
“irregularities to those which had arisen in the Corinthian Church,
“when the spirit that prevailed in these feasts became unsuited to the
“holy rite which followed, and partly by local circumstances which
“prevented generally the institution of such meals.” p. 443, *Gen.*
Hist. *Edinburgh*, 1847. The Heathen were not slow in casting
imputations upon Christians for these feasts. Tertullian alludes to
this in the following passage, which gives us also an insight into the
agape as it existed towards the end of the second century:—“Yet
“about the modest *supper room* of the Christians alone a great ado
“is made. Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call
“it love. Whatever it costs, our outlay in the name of piety is gain,
“since with the good things of the feast we benefit the needy. . . .
“As it is an act of religious service, it permits no violence or im-
“desty. The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to
“God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as
“much is drunk as befits the chaste. They say it is enough, as those
“who remember that during the night they have to worship God.”
Apology, 39. Tertullian continues to the same effect in refutation of
Pagan calumnies.

About the end of the 4th century, Chrysostom thus eulogises the feast :—"A custom most beautiful and most beneficial, for it was "a supporter of love, a solace of poverty, a moderator of wealth, and "a discipline of humility." But gradually, under the pressure of Heathen misrepresentation, a consideration of convenience, but more especially from the growth of superstitious notions as to the nature of the Lord's supper and the propriety of prevenient fasting, the original institution was completely changed, so that an ordinance which had been always administered after a meal, and generally in the evening, was at length preceded by fasting, and prohibited in the evening. The Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, passed the following decree :—"Ut sacramenta altaris non nisi a jejunis hominibus celebrantur, excepto uno die anniversario (*quo cæna Domini celebratur*)."—Labbe and Cossart, p. 963, vol. 1. Paris, 1714.

This prohibition bears a remarkable testimony to the nature of the Divine institution. It allows *non*-fasting, or evening communion, on Maundy Thursday, the anniversary of the institution of the Supper! Why limit the following of the example of Christ to one day in the year?

The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 372, forbade the agape, and decreed as follows: "Non oportet in dominicis seu ecclesiis *agapen* facere, "et intus manducare vel accubitus sternare."—p. 784, et supra.

What was allowed in apostolic and primitive times is forbidden by the Church of Rome! Evening Communion after a meal was the rule in the earliest days of the Church; the present practice is an illustration of the innovations which time effects.

BUT, LASTLY, THERE IS NO RULE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FIXING THE HOUR FOR COMMUNION. Consequently, her members may exercise their own discretion in this matter. Dr. Hook says: "*There is no direction at what time of the day it shall be used, only "custom has determined that it shall be used in the forenoon.*"—*Church Dictionary*. The absence of direction gives an option to the clergy.

As to custom, Dr. Hook's statement is not strictly accurate. Morning prayer customarily begins at half-past ten or eleven o'clock, and the Communion does not usually commence till the noon has passed by. In Ireland, morning prayer has usually begun at twelve o'clock, so that the Lord's Supper extends far in the afternoon. We ask upon what principle is Communion proper at one or two o'clock, p.m., and not proper at eight o'clock, p.m.? On what principle is it proper after a morning meal, and not proper after an evening meal? But we observe from the *Church Times* that the Ritualists dislike even a noon celebration!

We sincerely hope that the clergy will not surrender their privileges in this matter. Evening Communion has the sanction of Christ and his Apostles, was the custom of the primitive Church, and is not contrary to the laws, but harmonious with the spirit of the Church of England.

GOSPEL FREEDOM, AND PRIESTLY TYRANNY.

THE English people are famed for their love of Liberty—not a freedom from such restraint as is involved in submission to the Commandments of God, or to moral principles, but from the tyranny of man's will, whether presented in the shape of priestcraft, despotism, or mob-law. The nation struggled for and won its Civil Liberty through many a bloody conflict, and for its Religious Liberty the martyrs died.

Our National Church, based on the Bible, and adopting this principle of freedom, carefully cast aside all earthly bondage. There is doubtless room within the comprehensiveness of our Church for varying shades of opinion as to the degree in which the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper may be efficacious as means of Grace, or as to the extent to which Church fellowship is connected with the faith of the individual and other kindred subjects; but we are now called on by certain men, who, though they have indeed subscribed the Articles of the Church, yet lay claim to the authority of sacrificing priests, requiring us to submit our souls to their keeping, and to accept their order as the sole channel through which the saving grace of God can flow.

It is with the view of offering a note of warning against these serious errors that the reader of this paper is invited to contrast the teaching of the Word of God and the teaching of the Church of England on the one hand, with the voice of the Sacerdotalists (or Ritualists) on the other, touching those essential points where the fulness and freedom of Gospel grace are intercepted or destroyed by means of the chain of priestly tyranny.

In a short paper it is impossible to do more than select certain leading passages, but in order that the reader may verify the selection and examine the context, each passage has references attached.

1. THE ONE COMPLETE AND FINISHED SACRIFICE.

God's Word Written.

It is finished.—St. John xix. 30. And the veil of the temple was rent in twain, from the the top to the bottom.—St. Matt. xxvii. 51.

Now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.—Heb. ix. 26.

Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say His blood.—Id. x, 19, 20.

By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all.—Id. x. 10, also 12, 14.

And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more . . . Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.—Id. 17, 18.

Christ once suffered for sins; the just for the unjust.—1 Pet. iii. 18.

He is the propitiation for our sins.—1 St. John ii. 2.

Church of England teaching.

“The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”—Art. 31.

See also Article 25, defining sacraments as “sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace.”

“We must then take heed lest of a memory it (the Lord’s Supper) be made a sacrifice.”—27th Homily.

“Whereas Christ commanded to His Church a *sacrament* of His body and blood, they have changed it into a *sacrifice* for quick and dead.”—28th Homily.

2. CHRIST’S WORK ALONE NECESSARY TO SALVATION.

God’s Word Written.

I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth in Me though he were dead, yet shall he live.—St. John xi. 25.

And this is Life Eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.—Id. xvii. 3.

Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.—Acts xvi. 31.

Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under Heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.—Id. iv. 12.

Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious blood of Christ.—1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

In whom we have redemption through His blood; the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace.—Eph. i. 7.

And they sang a new song, saying—Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests.—Rev. v. 9, 10.

Church of England teaching.

“Holy Scripture doth set out unto us, only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.”—Art. 18.

“That we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.”—Art. 11.

3. JESUS THE ONLY WAY OF ACCESS TO GOD.

God's Word Written.

I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me.—St. John xiv. 6.

Him that cometh unto Me, I will in no wise cast out.—Id. vi. 37.

I am the door: by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.—Id. x. 9. See also xv. 5.

Behold I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it.—Rev. iii. 8.

Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access, by faith, into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.—Rom. v. 1, 2.

In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him.—Eph. iii. 12.

The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and His ears are open unto their prayers.—1 Pet. iii. 12.

Church of England teaching.

“Although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity to salvation.”—Art. 20.

“We ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins, but our Saviour Jesus Christ; who being Sovereign Bishop, doth with the sacrifice of His body and blood, offered once for ever upon the altar of the Cross, most effectually change the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins of all those that with true confession of the same do flee unto Him.”—Homily on Repentance.

4. JESUS THE ONLY MEDIATOR AND ADVOCATE.

God's Word Written.

There is One God, and One Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.—1 Tim. ii. 5.

And for this cause He is the Mediator of the New Testament; that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.—Heb. ix. 15.

He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them.—Heb. vii. 25.

Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died—yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.—Rom. viii. 34.

If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous.—1 St. John ii. 1.

And when I saw Him, I fell at His feet as dead. And He laid His right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first, and the last: I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell, and of death.—Rev. i. 17, 18.

These things, saith He, that holdeth the seven stars in His right hand; who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks.—Rev. ii. 1.

Church of England teaching.

"Christ . . . took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day."—Art. iv.

"Thou needest no other man's help; no sacrificing priest."—27th Homily.

5. FREE ACCESS TO THE THRONE OF GRACE.

God's Word Written.

Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.—St. Matt. xi. 28.

All that the Father giveth Me, shall come to Me, and him that cometh unto Me I will in nowise cast out.—St. John vi. 37.

If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink.—Id. vii. 37.

Ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.—Id. xvi. 24.

In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Him.—Eph. iii. 12.

Let us therefore come boldly unto the Throne of Grace that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.—Heb. iv. 10.

Having therefore boldness to enter into the holiest . . . let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.—Id. x. 22.

And the Spirit and the bride say, Come: and let him that heareth say, Come: and let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will, let him take of the Water of Life freely.—Rev. xxii. 17.

Church of England teaching.

“It is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance.”—*Sermons and Homilies*, 372.

“And whereas the adversaries go about to wrest this place (St. James v. 16) for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others; for if this test ought to be understood of auricular confession, then the priests are as much bound to confess themselves unto the lay-people, as the lay-people to them.”—Id. 371.

Have we not here a full and free provision for the deliverance of sinners from the darkness of sin, and for their adoption into the glorious liberty of the children of God? “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God . . . and this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you.”—1 Pet. i. 23 and 25.

Turn now to the doctrinal teaching of the Sacerdotalists, or Ritualists.

1. *The Lord's Supper declared to be a propitiatory Sacrifice.*

“It is no bare sign of an absent victim that we offer before God in the Holy Eucharist; no mere bread and wine figuratively signifying the body and blood of Christ . . . but by the real presence of the body and blood of Christ veiled beneath the form of bread and wine, we offer before God Christ Himself.”—*The Mediation of the Church*, p. 46.

“The faith once delivered derives its whole efficacy from a right appreciation, primarily of the doctrine of the Incarnation, and depending on that, the real actual presence of our Lord on the altars of our churches.”—*Plea for Toleration*, 3rd edit. 2.

“The presence must be objective . . . It does not depend in any manner on our faith.”—*Tracts for the Day*, v. 26.

“The holy Eucharist is Christ's offering itself—the very same which He made on Calvary, offered in a different manner.”—*Christian Sacrifice*.

“Body of Christ save me,
Blood of Christ inebriate me.”—*Divine (!) Liturgy*, p. 30.

" Most high and adorable Sacrament,
Most holy of all sacrifices,
True propitiation for the living and the dead,
Have mercy on us."—*Little Prayer Book*, p. 23.

2. *This assumed Sacrifice declared to be essential.*

" The penitent is taught to seek Christ, not within himself individually, but without himself, in the Church, in the sacrament which Christ Himself appointed."—*Tracts for the Day*, iii. 60.

" Not a single step can be taken in the supernatural life without the cooperation of sacraments. No sacramental grace can be applied to individuals without the intervention of ■ personal agency."—*Sermons on Sin*. Rev. O. Shipley.

" It is not a bloody sacrifice but unbloody, in which by a way which Christ set up we make His sacrifice always present, and offer and plead it as the only procuring cause of salvation."

" Those Christians who are never present when the holy Eucharist is offered up, never plead for their pardon and forgiveness in that one way which Christ ordered that they should plead."

" The holy communion is one of the sacraments which the Church declares to be to all persons in general, without regard to their calling, necessary to salvation."—*Eucharistic Manual*.

3. *Hence necessity for a sacrificing Priesthood.*

" None but priests can offer a Sacrifice, therefore Christ ordained His apostles to be priests to offer His body and His blood to God the Father, under the sacrificial veils of bread and wine, as the one true Sacrifice which can take away the sins of the world."

" The Christian priesthood sums up the offices which under the old covenants were distributed. The priest was the sacrificing, the prophet the preaching, and the judge the ruling officer. The Catholic priest at the altar offers the adorable Saviour—in the pulpit he declares the oracles of God, and in the confessional he sits in his judicial capacity."—*Tracts for the Day*, i. 25.

" His office, and the reverence due, depend entirely on that cardinal doctrine of the earthly priesthood as the divinely appointed channel through which the Omnipotent power of the sinless High Priest in Heaven is conveyed to the ordinances of the Church, and through them applied to the souls of His members."—*The Ministry of Consolation*, 56.

4. *Thence the assumption of Priestly power of Absolution.*

" It has been ordained that the guests at this banquet must be clothed in marriage garments, and that the same men who are com-

missioned to provide the supper are entrusted with the charge of excluding those who are not thus clothed. It is for this very purpose that our Lord has committed to these stewards of His Mysteries, those judicial functions which are often described as the power of the keys."—*Bp. of Salisbury's Charge*, 1867.

"If priestly absolution be the means ordained of God for remitting sin, then it is fearful to contemplate the ruin which may have been inflicted on souls by the neglect of it. Souls have been launched into eternity by us unabsolved, because we either did not believe in the power given us at our ordination, or we seem too timid to exert it."—*Tracts for the Day*, i. 21.

"God alone is the giver of all spiritual life, and grace and favour, and yet we are not bid to go direct to God for these gifts, (for that right we forfeited at the fall,) but we are to go to the Church which stands between us and God in its appointed sphere, in the same way as civil governments do in theirs, and parents in theirs."—*The Mediation of the Church*, 9.

"It is no mere question of courtesy, which must influence us in reverence for the priest . . . he is regarded as one possessed of nothing less than the authority of the Lord Christ, as the Church commands him to declare, with his own mouth, in the Absolution."—*The Ministry of Consolation; a Guide to Confession*, p. 56.

5. *Involving the necessity of Confession to the Priest.*

"The Church has in some cases required—in our own strongly recommended the practice of private confession and absolution as the only proper preparation for the worthy reception of the sacrament."—*Tracts for the Day*, iv. 80.

"In truth it were utterly impossible for the priest to give absolution, unless he had a perfect knowledge of all other sins that burden the conscience of the penitent."—*The Ministry of Consolation; a Guide to Confession*, 32.

"Confession, that true confession to which alone absolution is promised or can be given, must be, so far as it is possible to make it, an actual forestalling of the judgment."—*Ib.* 29.

"In the English Church, though enjoined in particular cases, confession is not enforced by any penalty, except that of losing the benefit which the proper and timely use of this ordinance would afford."—*The Ordinance of Confession*.

How striking the contradiction of this complex chain of Sacerdotal teaching to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus! The "true Christian liberty" spoken of in the Homilies (which writings our Church in the 35th Article declares to contain godly and wholesome doctrine)

would be wholly denied us if these priestly pretensions were accepted. Once admit the necessity for a present Sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ as a propitiation for sin, and we are instantly bound with priestly fetters. If there must be sacrifice, there must also be a priest to offer it, and an altar whereon to lay it. Nor can any partake the offering—save those, who by confession and absolution, have obtained from the priest the remission of their sins. In fact, without confession, there would be no absolution: nor without absolution, any sacramental grace, or any procuring cause of salvation available to the soul.

Shall those who have heard the joyful sound of the Gospel—who are members of that Church whose teaching we have seen to be so fully in accord with “Gospel freedom”—whose forefathers secured the blessed privileges of the Reformation; shall they, of all men, now submit to the thralldom of “Priestly Tyranny.” The struggle is at hand, so let all faithful members of the Church prepare for the inevitable conflict.

The Ritualists (as may be more fully tested by reference to Church Association Tract No. 4) make no secret of their hostility to the work of the Reformation, and their repugnance to the Articles of our Church. They are striving to bring us back into the bondage of superstition, and to “destroy our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus.” We must, therefore, contend as for our spiritual life. We must follow the noble example of St. Paul when he was confronted by “false brethren”—“To whom” (says he) “we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour; that the truth of the Gospel might remain with you.”—Gal. ii. 5.

Note.—Without desiring in any degree to detract from the high appreciation in which the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper (as a means of grace) is held, it may not be unimportant, in view of the desire of the Ritualists to elevate it as the “great central act of worship,” to remind faithful enquirers that while there are twenty-one Epistles in the New Testament, there is no direction, save in one, for the administration or reception of the Lord’s Supper. Surely if this Sacrament were intended by God as “the great central act of worship,” or as the special channel for conveying grace, St. Paul would have referred to it when writing to Timothy and Titus, who must have been, according to Ritualists, sacrificing Priests. Every enquirer must see the strong contrast which exists between the writings of the Ritualists and the Epistles of St. Paul.

THE DOGMATIC TEACHING OF BIBLE TRUTHS.

By REV. E. GARBETT, M.A., VICAR OF SURBITON.

THE question suggested is very broad ; it is not in what manner dogmatic truth can be best presented, which would be much narrower, but it is what attitude we should assume in regard to the dogmatic teaching of Bible truths. Thus the whole question is open for consideration, whether Bible truths are to be taught dogmatically or not. The question itself does indeed suggest the answer, which many of us, I hope all of us, will unhesitatingly give. For it suggests a guiding principle, in the implied assertion that we are in possession of Bible truths, that is of truths given to us by immediate inspiration of God the Holy Spirit. Let the force of this one expression be considered. We have things to teach which are truths, not guesses, not theories, not conjectures, but truths, and therefore as the nature of all truth is, immutable. They are Bible truths and therefore part of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. They are contained in a book which comes from God to man, and which consequently, since the designs of God do not change on one side, and the wants of men's souls can admit of no modification on the other, can not change with lapse of years or alteration of manners. They are truths relative to the most practical subject which could possibly exercise the thoughts of a reasonable being, namely, how he is to find pardon and acceptance with God. They are truths with which the Church is put into charge with the solemn commission to go and preach them to all nations. If we believe that we are in possession of such Bible truths, the question whether a dogmatic teaching is to be maintained is no longer open. It is settled so far as we are concerned by the higher authority of God.

There appears to me to be incalculable comfort to the heart and rest to the mind in thus falling back upon a principle. What is right must be wise, because righteousness and wisdom are two rays from the same Sun, two attributes of the one perfect God. To strike a balance between contradictory expediences is the most anxious and difficult of tasks which may make the brain weary and the heart sick. Take, for instance, the general subject of to-day, how the Church of England is to maintain her place in the hearts of the English people. The English people are a very compound thing and comprise a vast diversity of opinions, feelings and interest. One portion of the English people are utterly indifferent to all religious truth ; another portion are impatient of anything like a dogma, with an intensity of infidel intolerance to which the asserted bigotry of Protestants is as nothing ; another portion are too utterly contemptuous of the faith to care one feather whether we teach it or not ; another are craving for truth they have not found ; and others so fond of dogma that they are scared by the very statement of a doubt as a child is scared by a

■

ghost. Who is to balance these several parties together, and decide, on grounds of expediency, which it is wisest to please, which safest to displease? One person tells us that we must rub off the sharp edges of doctrinal truth, and hide with the pretty ornaments of rhetoric the wholesome bitterness and offence of the Cross. O! cries another, if you do not take care the age will leave you behind, till, the tide of free thought flowing in, the Church will be left like a stranded wreck—solitary and alone. A third gravely recommends that we should sweep away all doctrines save the bare letter of the Apostles' Creed, or a declaration of faith in the Trinity. Yet another chides our faith for maintaining what he conceives to be the useless niceties of doctrine instead of preaching the broad gospel of universal philanthropy and benevolence. What mortal intellect can with any confidence so balance the number and influence of all these respective sections as to say, on the argument of mere expediency, what we ought to do or ought not to do? One friend believes the heart of the people to be Protestant and Evangelical. A second believes that the whole nation is fast going over to Popery. A third shouts in our ears, and men of the highest scientific eminence adopt the cry, that Christianity is a dead thing, and cannot last another ten years. I turn from this Babel of sounds, with the deepest gratitude, to the calm, clear, unfaltering voice of God. I step from this shifting sand of expediency to the solid rock of duty, and breathe freely as I feel that firm foundation beneath my feet. Did not God know all, foresee all, foredetermine all when He gave us that Bible which sketches all the struggles of the Church till her Master comes again? Was not every changing mood and circumstance of the world, every fancy and caprice of human nature, every contingency of human events, present to His mind? If the Bible be of God, and if the Bible, which is of God, does not suggest theories for discussion, but propounds truths for belief, then I can no more alter God's order of grace than I can derange his order in nature, or pull the sun out of yonder sky. I can indeed at midday shut the light out of my own chamber, and, closing every crevice, declare that it is midnight; but it will not be midnight nevertheless—outside my narrow room a rejoicing world will bask meanwhile in the glorious sunshine. Earthly mists may wrap in gloom the ground on which we walk, or driving tempests hurry through the lower atmosphere; but the clear heights of heaven are above them, and the calm sun in his strength looks down all the same on the darkness and storm below.

I conclude, therefore, that if there are Bible truths there must also be a dogmatic teaching of those truths. But though we cannot change the doctrines, may we not adapt to the circumstances of the day the mode in which we teach them? I believe that we may. And I believe that as to the manner of dogmatic teaching, as well as to the necessity of dogmatic teaching, the same words which I take as my keynote may still suffice to teach us "Bible truths." In the propriety of adapting our mode of teaching to the needs of the times, I entirely agree with our critics, although I may differ from them widely asunder as the antipodes as to the mode of applying the principle.

1. We should teach Bible truths as truths—teach as those who believe them to be truths, not probabilities for conjecture, not theories for discussion, not themes for intellectual exercise, but as truths which

we hold and proclaim as from God. The commission of Ezekiel is our commission also. "I do send thee unto them, and thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord; and they, whether they hear or whether they forbear, shall know that there hath been a prophet among them."

But I must explain. I do not mean that we should teach Bible truths with a temper or tone of personal dogmatism. Certainty of the truth need not grow into hardness or severity in propounding it. The more true it is, the more fixed and certain to the convictions of our own minds as expressing the will and carrying with it the authority of God, the more quiet and gentle we may be in the proclamation of it. Perfect faithfulness in the message may coexist with perfect humility in the delivery. There is no contrariety between truth and love. Hence there should be firmness as to the matter, with the utmost gentleness as to the manner—adherence to things without any impatience of persons. Remember the Arab fable of Abraham turning a stranger out of his shelter into the storm because he was shocked with the stranger's heterodoxy, and God's reply, "I have borne with him for five and seventy years; canst not thou bear with him for one night?"

Nor do I mean that every matter of theological opinion is to be put by us on the same platform as Bible truth—the truth, for instance, of the fall and sin, the atonement, justification by faith, regeneration by the Spirit, and doctrines of the same kind. We must be jealously and prayerfully cautious not to confound secondary truths with primary truths, circumstantials with essentials. But this is so large a theme that I must not pursue it.

Neither do I mean that we are to teach them on Church authority, but on the authority of God—not alone as truths, but as Bible truths. This is the fatal mistake which many members of the Church of England make, and to which expression was given in a recent letter published in the *Times*—the mistake of confounding authority with testimony. We may avail ourselves of the authority of the Church in regard to Scriptural doctrine, but we receive it only on the authority of the Bible. A more fatal mistake in dogmatic teaching than that of always thrusting the Church forward instead of the Church's Master I cannot conceive. No plea is so fitted to irritate and provoke opposition and to arm the minds of men in this age of liberty against the truths we wish to commend, and no plea can be more false or more dangerous. For if we receive truth on the authority of the Church, then *whatever* has the authority of the Church must be received as truth, whatever it may be, or however false. It is in fact the essential plea of the Church of Rome, and no Protestant dress can change or long conceal its essentially Popish features.

Nor do I mean that we are to teach dogma as a thing to supersede reason, and so put it offensively with a "must,"—you must believe this; but we should teach it as a thing which appeals to reason. The credentials of the Bible are open to every man's investigation. Let a man satisfy himself that this particular truth is contained in the Bible just as we teach it, neither more nor less. It must at all times be difficult for human pride to receive the humbling doctrines of the Cross. Let us not needlessly irritate it, but speak rather in the gracious tone of God, "Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord."

But I mean that we are to teach Bible truths with firmness and confidence, and a full, entire persuasion in their truths, not timidly, not hesitatingly, not doubtfully, as those who are but groping for truth themselves and have to find out their own faith, but as those who have found it, and love it, and live on it, who find in it the light of their intellect and the joy of their hearts. I believe this personal conviction to be of the essence of all persuasion. I conceive that they are thoroughly wrong who proposed to cure men's doubts by doubting themselves. And I cannot but think the Evangelical Church may learn a lesson alike from our Ritualistic opponents and from Rome herself. We must never forget that Rome exercises moral power not alone over the weak, the ignorant and uneducated, but over some of the subtlest intellects, profoundest scholars, and deepest thinkers of the day. What commends her to these men but the rest and repose which her tone and air of authority supply to minds sick with doubt and desperate with scepticism? They need to rest somewhere, and in the ignorance of the true infallibility, the infallibility of God, they rest on a false infallibility, the infallibility of the Church. The soul does need an infallible guide, and we have it in the unerring Word and omniscient Spirit of all truth, who interprets that word to the intellect and the heart. I have no wish to copy Rome, or to forget the gulf into which she is blindfold precipitating herself. But *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*. Rome is wise after the wisdom of the children of this world, at all events. She does not, I believe, mistake the spirit and tendency of the age when she offers to the weary brain rest within her bosom from all tormenting doubts. Let us offer the same rest; only let it be the bosom of God and the truth of that word of which not one jot or one tittle shall ever pass away till all be fulfilled.

Our attitude should, therefore, be that not of the doubter, but of the worshipper; not of the inquirer, but of the teacher; not of the philosopher, but of the prophet commissioned by God. We should teach Bible truths with firmness of tone and clearness and precision of statement, with all the edges of doctrine clean cut and sharply defined, as we find them in the Word. We should teach them tenderly and affectionately, on their moral side rather than on their theological; treating doctrines not as so many propositions of divinity, but as so many precious truths needed by men's souls, and which alone can give to the struggling heart either peace or glory hereafter. We should teach them experimentally, out of the fulness of our own hearts, as those who live upon them ourselves, and know them in our personal experience to be precious, or rather know Him to be precious who gathers round his own glorious self all doctrine, and in his own single person all fulness of grace and truth. Lastly, we should teach them with constant reference to the Holy Spirit of God as alone able to explain them to the mind, or to open an entrance for them into the heart. So teaching them we shall, I believe, do God's will. Whether we please man or not, we shall please our Master, and pleasing Him shall find in his will our surest and safest guide for the present, and in his loving care the most ample and effectual provision for the dangers and perplexities of the future.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND OF HIS MEMBERS. WHAT IS IT?

"WE HAVE AN ALTAR." WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

IN spite of all that has been said and written of late years upon the subject of the Christian Priesthood, the number of those persons seems to be continually increasing, who either assert or admit that there is a sense in which Christian ministers may be called—not *Presbyters* only, but in the sacrificial, sacerdotal, and mediatorial sense, *Priests*.

Now, if the witness of Holy Scripture is plain and unmistakeable upon any subject, surely it is plain on this. The relation of the Levitical Priesthood to the Priesthood of our Lord is clearly stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The same portion of Holy Scripture contains an equally clear statement of the doctrine of His Priesthood after the order of Melchizedek.

And yet the words which are perhaps most continually employed as an argument by Sacerdotalists,—“We have an altar”—are taken from this very book.

The epistle to the Hebrews forbids the possibility of a priesthood in the Church Militant, by asserting that “*if the Lord Jesus Himself were upon earth, He would not be a priest.*” Surely there is some misunderstanding, if the very book which makes a priesthood upon earth (at least in the present dispensation) absolutely impossible, is also made to declare that “*we have an altar*” in the very churches where we have no priest.

The truth is that the passage containing those words “we have an altar,” is itself the most undoubted proof that that altar cannot be the table of the Lord. We believe that this can be *proved* without possibility of refutation.

Meanwhile, we must ask the indulgence of our readers for a few moments, while we endeavour to point out, as carefully and accurately as we may, what is the definition of our Lord’s priesthood, given in the portion of Holy Scripture already referred to. The epistle to the Hebrews is, to a great extent, a dogmatic theological treatise upon this subject. Any one who would understand it must not only examine the argument there given, but also acquaint himself with the provisions of the law of Moses there referred to. And a careful inquiry into the nature of the Priesthood, as here set forth, will shew that there is quite as much of carelessness in the common Evangelical way of stating the doctrine on the one hand, as there is of error in the theories adopted by sacerdotalists on the other. For instance, how often do we hear it said by preachers, that there are three offices of our Divine Lord, to which He was anointed by the Holy Spirit: the offices of the Prophet, the Priest, and the King. So far true. But the explanation usually added is this, He is our Prophet in His divine teaching, *our Priest in His death* and intercession, *our King in His glory*. Now this superficial way of stating

the doctrine, viz., that Christ was our Priest in His death, is *not* the statement that we find in the epistle to the Hebrews. A very different view is given there. It would be much nearer the truth to say that He did not become our priest until He ascended into Heaven. He was *not even called to the office* until His resurrection from the dead. He was qualified and prepared for it during His life. He entered the true Holy of Holies *by virtue of* His death; He was *called* to the Priesthood at His resurrection. He *began the exercise of His office* when He ascended up on High.

Let us point out briefly the manner in which the Holy Spirit has stated these truths.

In the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, the duties and necessary qualifications of a High Priest are clearly defined. We read there, that

(1) He is taken from among men.

(2) He is ordained for (on behalf of) men, *i.e.* to be their representative, in things pertaining unto God.

(3) He must be acquainted with human infirmity that he may be able to sympathize with those whom he represents.

(4) He must have a *call from God*, as Aaron had, or he cannot take the office.

These several qualifications are then shewn to be fulfilled in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The writer begins with *His call*, in ch. v. 5:—"Christ glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest, but He that said unto Him, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee.'"

Now these words (from Psalm ii.) being here applied especially to our Lord's *manhood* (for the High Priesthood is a *Human office*, and strictly *representative*) must refer to *some particular time* in our Lord's *human life*. "*This day*," if the expression be applied to our Lord's Divinity (as in Heb. i. 5) may of course mean "from the beginning"—but when applied to His manhood, it must have a more limited reference. *What* it refers to, we learn from St. Paul's sermon at Antioch (Acts xiii. 32, 33). "*He hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.*"

The *day* referred to is, therefore, clearly, the day of our Lord's *resurrection from the dead*. He is in other places called the "first begotten from the dead," "the first begotten," "the first fruits," "the first born among many brethren."

But in Heb. v. 6, another passage is also quoted, as declaring our Lord's *call* to be an High Priest. We read, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee, *as He saith also* in another place, 'Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek.'" That "other place" is the Psalm cx, a Psalm whose opening words are a note of resurrection-glory: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."

After our Lord's call to the High-Priesthood, we have the statement of His qualifications. He too was in His lifetime compassed with infirmity. He "*learned the obedience*" (*i.e.* the whole sum of human obedience, with all its *cost*) "*by the things that He suffered:*" and being *made perfect* (τελειωθείς, consecrated, the very word used in the Old Testament for the consecration of a priest), "*He became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey Him.*"

Now, a very little consideration of this word, "made perfect," will shew that our Lord could not have been our High Priest on earth during His lifetime. He was "made perfect through suffering." "He learned the obedience through the things which He suffered." "He was obedient until death." Until He died, His obedience, His sufferings, His human experience, were not complete. He could not be a perfect human representative, until He had endured all the trials and conflicts which belong to man. Until His death, His training for the priesthood was not finished. What time so appropriate for His call to that important office, as the day of His resurrection from the dead! How could He have entered on it before? In considering the subject of our Lord's priesthood, it is most important not to lose sight of *its reality*. The Christian Priesthood is no mere shadowy contrivance for representing certain realities that are transacted in some distant region at some distant time; *it is itself the real thing*. It is not a new scaffolding, it is the building itself. Either it is the end of all shadows, or it is nothing at all. Those who are to be priests in Christ, must be *real priests*, as His Priesthood is real. The time for types and shadows is over, and the substance is come. It is not too much to ask of those who lay claim to the sacerdotal office in the church on earth, that they should shew the same *call*, the same *qualifications* as their Master. Let them shew that they have had experience of all human suffering. Let them prove that, like their Master, they have been glorified to the office, by their resurrection from the dead! We have, however, two other points to consider concerning the nature of our Lord's Priesthood.

(1.) The sacrifice by virtue of which He entered upon it.

(2.) His actual entrance upon the office itself.

With respect to the first of these two points, there is no question whatever that the sacrifice essential to our Lord's priesthood was His death upon the Cross. But it is of some importance to notice *what kind of sacrifice* this was, in relation to His Priestly work. *All* the manifold offerings ordained by the law of Moses were fulfilled by the great offering of Christ. Still there is *one offering*, that is especially connected with High Priesthood, which it is necessary to consider now.

Our Saviour's High Priesthood is taken up in the Epistle to the Hebrews, at its most important point. He is shewn to be our High Priest, by His performance, in the fullest and most perfect manner, of that act, which none but the High Priest could do. We allude to the *sin-offering* on the great day of *atonement*, once every year, with the blood of which the High Priest was permitted to enter within the veil. Now the conditions of this offering are strictly defined by the law of Moses; and they ought to be carefully noted and understood.

There were five great kinds of Offerings or Sacrifices under the Mosaic Law.

1. The burnt offering—all for God. But the priest who offered it had the *skin* for himself.

2. The meat offering. A portion (called the *memorial*) was burnt upon the altar. The rest was eaten by the priests.

3. The peace offering. A portion was burnt upon the altar. A portion was eaten by the man who brought the offering.

4. The *sin-offering*. This was of various kinds and designs, as—
 See Leviticus iv. (a) For a priest.
 (b) For the whole congregation
 (c) For a ruler.
 (d) For one of the common people.

If the sin-offering was of the class (a) or (b), *the blood must be brought into the tabernacle*. If it was of the class (c) or (d), *this was unnecessary*. Now the law made an important distinction here. *If any of the blood of the sin-offering had been brought into the holy place, no portion whatever of the body might be eaten; it must be burnt in a clean place without the camp.*—(Lev. vi. 30.) In all other cases, the priest that offered it might eat it, when a certain part had been taken and burnt upon the altar before God.

5. The trespass-offering was a sub-division of the sin-offering, which we need not enlarge on here.

Now the blood which the High Priest brought into the Holy of Holies on the great day of atonement, was the blood of a sin offering of the first two classes (a) and (b): *which were offered for the priest, and for the whole people*. With this blood he entered not only into the tabernacle, but within the veil. It is clear, therefore, that *no one would be permitted to eat of the sin-offering*. The whole of it, even to the skin, (which was preserved in the case of a burnt offering) must be burnt, a part of it on the altar, but the larger portion *without the camp*.

With reference to our Saviour's priesthood, His death was a *sin-offering of this sort*. By His blood He entered—not into the Holy of Holies made with hands—but into Heaven itself, the real secret of God's presence, within the veil.

Who can fail to see what follows, viz., that, *however we become partakers of the virtue of our Lord's great sin-offering, we cannot partake by eating? The sin-offering whose blood is brought in to sanctify, is not eaten, but burned without the camp*.

And this is precisely the argument of the writer of the Epistle, in the famous passage in the thirteenth chapter, of which Sacerdotalists and Ritualists make so much. "*We have an altar say they,*" and think our mouths are stopped. But what is the context? "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines: for it is a good thing that the heart be established *with grace, not with meats*, (observe the contrast) *which have not profited them that have been exercised therein.*" Now follows the famous sentence, which should be read thus:—"We have an altar, of which they that serve the tabernacle have no right to eat." The words italicized are *emphatic*, the words which are generally made much of the "*we*" and "*they*," are not even expressed in the original. The verbs are in the 1st and 3rd persons respectively, and that is all. But to proceed. What is this altar of which we have no right to eat? The brazen altar for sacrifice? Certainly not: the tabernacle worshipper did occasionally eat of that. The incense altar in the Holy place? It never received anything that was eatable. The table of the shewbread? No. What was it then? Read on, and we see at once. "*We have an altar, whereof we must not eat, for the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin are*"—not eaten, no, not one morsel of them, but—"burned, without the

camp." There is the altar. It was "the clean place without the camp, where the ashes were poured out," and where the body of the sin offering was "burnt on wood with fire," (Leviticus iv. 12). A strange altar certainly, but an altar, for all that. It was, in a figure, the place of our Lord's crucifixion. "Behold the fire and the wood," and behold also the Lamb for the sin-offering. And where was it made? At "Golgotha," "the place of a skull," "the place where the ashes" (of the dead) "were poured out." So the writer goes on to tell us in Heb. xiii. "*Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood,*" (when He should enter by virtue of it within the vail) *suffered without the gate* (of Jerusalem). He also, the true sin-offering, was to have His blood brought into the Holy of Holies. And therefore, like a true sin-offering, He cannot be eaten, but must needs "suffer without the gate." What shall we do then? How can we be made partakers of the benefit of that offering for sin? By eating? No: it is forbidden: it is impossible. How then? Let the sacred writer answer for himself. "Let us therefore go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." In His own words, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." No; of Christ as a peace offering or a meat offering it might be possible to eat, but Christ as a sin offering cannot be approached in that way. The only way to partake of Him is to be "crucified with Him," to be united with Him in His death and sufferings; to "go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach."

And yet in the face of all this, which is really so plain on the surface of the text, that to miss it is most inexcusable; we are told by triumphant Ritualists, that "*we have an altar*" of which *the Jews* have no "right to eat; and it is the Lord's table!" But this is *not* an altar of which *some* persons are allowed to eat, and not others—it is *an altar of which no living being ever ate at all*. There is no contrast between *we* and *they*; the pronouns are absolutely omitted in the original. And they who serve the tabernacle are, *in the type*, Jews, but *in the reality*, Christians. All the figures in this Epistle have their corresponding realities. The true Holy of Holies is Heaven. The vail is the flesh of Christ. The High Priest is our Risen Lord. The altar of Heb. xiii. 10, is Golgotha, the place where He was crucified. Then what are the tabernacle-worshippers, but those who serve the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man? If one figure has a counterpart, so have all. There is no contrast drawn here between Jews and Gentiles. *There is no such contrast to be found in the whole epistle*. The writer identifies himself with his brethren throughout. Writing ostensibly to believing Hebrews, he speaks covertly to the unbelieving mass of the nation all the while. He speaks of the tabernacle service and Jerusalem as still existing. The tenses in the original are present, though the authorized version sometimes makes them past. In ix. 6, "*the priests enter,*" (not "*went*"); in v. 8. "*is yet standing*" (not "*was*"). In x. 1, "*which they offer*" (not offered) and so on. Just so in chapter xiii. 14, in the context of the very passage under consideration, he says, here "*we have no continuing city,*" i.e. Jerusalem on earth. Does this "*we*" mean Christians as opposed to Jews? We think

not. The notion that "*we* have an altar," refers to Christians as opposed to Jews, and that "they who serve the tabernacle" means Jews as opposed to Christians, and that the altar is the Lord's table is a blunder which no reader who can understand either the Greek language, or the connection of an argument, ought to commit. Truly ye "have an altar, whereof ye have no right to eat!" Draw not nigh hither! If this altar *be* the Lord's table, it is *not for you*.

Let us not be misunderstood. We fully believe that in the Holy Communion, the believer does feed by faith on Christ's body and blood offered for him. But the passage in Heb. xiii. teaches that there is *one aspect of our Lord's great sacrifice with which mere eating has nothing to do*. It is to this particular aspect, from which eating is excluded, that the words, "we have an altar," especially apply. And for this reason, the words in question have nothing to do with the Lord's table, or with the Holy Communion. We have one thing more to consider; viz., our Lord's entrance upon His priestly office.

With regard to this, one sentence of the Epistle to the Hebrews must ever remain in memory. "*If He were on earth, He should not be a priest,*" or rather, (more emphatically still), "*If He were on earth, He would not even be a priest.*" See how entirely His Priesthood is, in all things, according to the law. The priests (on earth) are they "who offer gifts according to the law," "who serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of heavenly things." And "it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." No. He who would *be* a priest, must either follow the letter of the Mosaic law, or, if he be a priest after the order of Melchizedek, he must fulfil the *reality*, of which the Levitical priesthood was the pattern, the figure, or the shadow. Our Lord was *really qualified* to represent mankind, by the experience of *His life*; He offered *the only real sacrifice*, in *His death*; He entered into the *real Holy of Holies*, at *His ascension into heaven*. Then He began His Priesthood, doing in reality, what had been done only in a figure before. In the *reality* of His work lies His *claim*. Those who would follow in His footsteps, must be as *real*, in all those things, as He.

But in what position do we stand, under His High Priesthood? Are there any laws which control *us*, during His exercise of that office?

Undoubtedly there are. We are the "real worshippers" (St. John iv. 23) of the "real tabernacle." What is the law for us? It is our "day of atonement," while the High Priest is still hidden beyond the vail. The Passover is over, now that Christ "*our Passover* has been slain for us." Pentecost also is past. We reached the 10th day of the 7th month, in our Lord's ascension, and there we stand, waiting, as the congregation waited on the day of atonement, until the High Priest shall re-appear. The sun, as it were, stands still. The day of atonement is prolonged. What Israelite could fail to hope for forgiveness while the High Priest was before God with the blood of the great sin-offering, slain for all Israel and for him? If we truly apprehend the position in which we are, as true Israelites, with reference to the Lord Jesus, can we fail to lay hold on the hope set before us, on the provision thus made for atonement, the "eternal redemption" "through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins?" But

can there be any earthly priesthood exercised, any earthly sin-offering presented, for the people, while the High-Priest is standing within the veil? It will be remembered what was the law of the sin-offering. If it were offered (a) for a priest, or (b) for the congregation, the blood of it must be brought into the holy place? (Leviticus iv. 5, 6, 16, 17.) Can this figure be fulfilled on earth now? What saith the Scripture? In Leviticus xvi. we read: "*There shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation, when he (the High Priest) goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel.*" Is not this conclusive? "*There shall be no man in the tabernacle.*" If "*no man,*" then certainly "*no priest;*" no blood of a sin-offering, no atonement for the congregation beside His. And why should there be? What would have been thought of a son of Aaron, who had ventured to take the blood of another victim or the rest of the blood of the same victim, and go to present it in the tabernacle, while his father was within the veil? Would it not have been an act of superfluous arrogance; rather of most perilous presumption? What mean these "sacrifices of masses," these "High celebrations," when a self-glorified priest on earth presumes to stand in the holy place with the blood of what he calls a sin-offering, while the High Priest Himself is standing within the veil? "*There shall be no man in the tabernacle, when he goeth in, until he come out.*" He is not come out yet? Whence this insolent disparagement of His ever-present atonement, while it is yet in full force? What was the punishment of Korah, and what was it for?

"Melchizedek King of Salem brought forth bread and wine; and he (was) the priest of the most High God." *There* was no sacrifice, but a Priesthood which had no end. How well is this suited to express the Priesthood which began when the actual sacrifice was over, to which God the Father called His Son Jesus, on the day when He brought Him again from the dead! Let it not be supposed that the priesthood of Melchizedek and the priesthood of Aaron are mere contradictions. They are true, both one and other, in the person of our Lord. After the order of Melchizedek, He was still the antitype of Aaron, doing in reality above, what Aaron did in a figure here below. But as Melchizedek's act was more simple and real than that of Aaron, so it lies nearer to the reality in the Lord Jesus Christ. Melchizedek's act is not law but prophecy. Aaron's is not only prophecy but law. The law of Aaron's priesthood is violated if it be changed on earth. Even our Saviour is excluded from an earthly priesthood, because he did not spring from Levi. This of itself will shew that we cannot venture to imitate (or paraphrase) the Aaronite priesthood, without exact literal obedience to all its rules. Only in so far as we do "in heart and mind thither ascend," "whither the forerunner is for us entered," so far are we priests of God and of Christ, not on earth, but in heaven. And if we are priests, then are we kings also—neither one nor other upon earth, but both already in heaven. The two things in Christ are inseparable. He became at once a King and a Priest, when He ascended to His Father's throne. But as He cannot be a Priest on earth until His second coming; so neither is He an earthly

King. On the contrary, it is most fitting that *they who claim an earthly priesthood, should claim an earthly kingdom too*. Were the two claims ever very far apart?

The place of the true minister is to follow John the Baptist, who, as he fulfilled his course, said, "Whom think ye that I am? *I am not He*. But behold there cometh one after me, *whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to loose*." It is not for nothing that *that saying* of John the Baptist has been *five times reported* in the New Testament, once by every Evangelist, and in the Acts too. It was used on three different occasions for certain, by the Baptist; probably (from the words in Acts xiii. 25, "*he used to say*") it was frequently on his lips. But has it not a meaning? Surely, it is not a mere chance expression of humility, that has come down from the greatest prophet, except the Lord Jesus, that woman ever bore! In the mouth of an Israelite, the "loosing of the shoe" cannot be without meaning. He who *took his neighbour's shoe* in Israel, *took his right to marry, or took his right to redeem*. Who will not see how significant these words are, in the mouth of such a one as John the Baptist? He was a *born priest*, of the purest origin; his father, Zacharias, of the house of Abia; his mother, of the daughters of Aaron, her very name identical with that of Aaron's wife. A born priest of purest origin; a born redeemer of Israel. Such was John the Baptist. And where did he spend his life? In the temple? At the altar? In the synagogue? In the place which the Lord had chosen out of all the tribes of Israel to put His Name there? No such thing. *We never find him in the temple in the whole course of his life*. No sacrifice of his is recorded; except the sacrifice of his own life. In the wilderness, by the banks of the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance, pointing to the Bridegroom, to the Lamb of God,—this was the place and this the manner of the last great prophet, *the last great Priest*, that the old Dispensation ever saw. "Whom think ye that I am? I am not He. I baptize "with water; but I am not the Bridegroom; *I cannot redeem*. He "that cometh after me is mightier than I, *whose shoes of His feet I am not worthy to loose*." In John the Baptist the law and the prophets gave up their priesthood to Him who now appeareth within the veil. "If He were on earth, even He would not be a priest; "and there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation, "while He goeth in, *until He come out*," we know not how soon. *Now* is our day of atonement. We *have* an altar; but it is the place of the ashes, the place called Golgotha, the hill outside Jerusalem, the standing-place of the Cross of Christ. "Let us go" thither, not only to eat (which of itself will not avail us), but "that we also may die with Him." So may we be partakers of His sufferings. So shall we become partakers of His kingdom. And then, "unto "Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own "blood, and hath made us *Kings and Priests* unto God and His "Father: to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."



No. X.



RESULTS OF APPEALS
TO THE
ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS
IN
RITUAL AND OTHER CASES.

CORRECTED TO JUNE, 1880.



RESULTS OF APPEALS TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS IN RITUAL CASES.

FIRST PREFACE.

The number and importance of the points upon which the Church Association has been instrumental in obtaining an authoritative declaration of the Law applicable to the Church of England, will best be judged of by examining them in a connected form; and thus all parties interested can readily ascertain what is the Law on these hitherto controverted points.

The Council have endeavoured throughout the contest to avoid all irritating remarks, although sometimes under considerable provocation. They reprint an article from the monthly *Intelligencer* of November, 1870, which best expresses their views and aspirations.

"The final Report of the Royal Commissioners on Ritual has justified in a remarkable degree the policy adopted by the Church Association. It will be remembered, that when the public mind was in a state of considerable agitation on account of the novelties introduced into the mode of conducting Public Worship, and the resumption by some of the clergy of costumes and ornaments which were supposed to have been finally banished from the Church of England, the opinions of eminent Counsel were taken by the leaders on each side of the controversy, which by their diversity on several material points, tended rather to increase than allay the excitement that prevailed. It was at this time that the late Mr. R. C. Hanbury addressed a letter to the *Times*, which resulted in the appointment of a Committee, whose able and energetic exertions induced the Government to advise Her Majesty to issue the Royal Commission on Ritual. The proceedings against the Incumbent of St. Alban's had then been commenced and some strong endeavours were made to induce the Church Association to suspend proceedings, and to abandon all attempts to obtain an authoritative legal decision on the points at issue, until after the Commissioners had made their report.

"This was a trying moment for the Council of the Church Association; but, anticipating the long delay, which has actually occurred before the publication of the Report, and fearing that, whatever that Report might be, there would be the utmost difficulty in inducing the Government to introduce any new measures into Parliament, the Council decided, that their duty remained unaltered to persevere in the necessary steps for obtaining the decision of the Judicial Committee.

"The final Report has at length appeared, and we may confidently assert that, but for legal proceedings which the Church Association have conducted at very great expense, no solution of the points at issue would have ever been arrived at, and the Church of England would have been torn in pieces by conflicting

parties, each of whom would have insisted that the law was on its side.

"There is every reason to believe that, before the close of the present year, every disputed point on Ritual will have received a final and authoritative decision. It would be presumptuous for the Church Association to assume that the decision will be in their favour on every point; but the immense advantage of having ascertained the actual condition of the law on these matters will assuredly be acknowledged, when each party shall have had sufficient time to reflect on the duties imposed on them by the removal of all doubt and uncertainty on the questions so long at issue."

SECOND PREFACE.

Since the above observations were written the Council have been forced into litigation for the purpose of enforcing orders and ascertaining the personal authority of the Dean of Arches. A summary is given of the present state of these questions.

ELEVATION OF THE PATEN AND CUP.

The sanction of the Court refused to any unnecessary elevation whatever.

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley) in delivering the Judgment of the Privy Council, on December 4th, 1869, said—

"It is most desirable, and their Lordships are all of opinion, that it should be distinctly understood, that they give no sanction whatever to a notion that any elevation whatever of the Elements, as distinguished from the mere act of removing them from the Table, and taking them into the hand of the Minister, is sanctioned by law. It is not necessary for their Lordships to say more (but most undoubtedly less we cannot say) than that we feel nothing has taken place in the course of this cause, that can possibly justify a conclusion, that any elevation whatever, as distinguished from the raising from the table, is proper or is sanctioned."—*Judgment Privy Council, Martin v. Mackonochie, Law Reports, Privy Council Appeals*, Vol. iii. part 1, 1870, page 63.

Alluding to the acts complained of at St. Alban's, Lord Chelmsford, in delivering the Judgment of the Privy Council, Nov. 25th, 1870, on an application to enforce obedience to the Monition issued against Mr. Mackonochie, said—

"It appears then, that the practice is, that, upon the officiating clergyman reaching the solemn words of institution in the Prayer of Consecration, he drops his voice so as to be nearly inaudible; a bell begins to toll; that he then elevates [not the paten but] a wafer, and replacing it upon the communion-table, bows his head down towards the table, and remains for some seconds in this position; that he then elevates the cup, and replacing it on the table bows down as before, after which the administration of the elements commences."

"Now, the conclusion to be drawn from this statement of facts is, that Mr. Mackonochie having determined to yield the merest literal obedience to the precise letter of the monition, had resolved that neither he nor his curates should elevate the paten or the cup above their heads during the Prayer of Consecration; but in consequence of the difficulty of keeping to the exact degree of elevation intended, the officiating clergyman, unconsciously and unintentionally, elevated the wafer and the cup to the extent mentioned in the affidavits. But if Mr. Mackonochie has been (as he admitted), carefully scanning the monition and the Order in Council to see how he could keep exactly within them, and has been acting upon his understanding "that legal judgments should be interpreted according to their letter," he has no right to complain of the letter, if the monition is applied against him, and he is made accountable for an actual non-compliance with its terms, whatever his intentions to obey it may have been. The act of elevation to the

prohibited degree was witnessed; the secret intention could not be known. That the elevation charged took place during the Prayer of Consecration appears from the evidence of Mr. Mackonochie, that the raising of the wafer and of the cup takes place after the words of institution in each kind; consequently, the wafer, at least, must be raised as the Prayer is proceeding.

"In the attempt to satisfy his conscience, and to shelter himself under the narrowest literal obedience to lawful authority, Mr. Mackonochie has been a second time foiled. Upon the former occasion their Lordships, after expressing their opinion judicially that the monition had been disobeyed, did not think it necessary to do more to mark their disapprobation of Mr. Mackonochie's course of proceeding than by directing that he should pay the costs of the application. Upon this repetition of his offence their Lordships think that they ought to proceed further. They therefore declare that Mr. Mackonochie has not complied with the monition in respect of the elevation of the paten or wafer, nor as abstaining from prostration before the consecrated elements. And they order, that he be suspended for the space of three calendar months from the time of notice of the suspension, from all discharge of his clerical duties and offices, and the execution thereof—that is to say, from preaching of the Word of God, and administering the Sacraments, and celebrating all other clerical duties and offices; and further, that he pay the costs of the application."—*Judgment of Privy Council, Martin v. Mackonochie, Law Journal Reports, Ecclesiastical Cases*, Vol. xl. part 4, April, 1871, p. 5 to 7.

ELEVATION OF CHALICE.

The Rev. John Purchas was charged, "that while reading the prayer for the 'whole state of Christ's Church Militant here on earth,' you stood with your back to the people, in front of the middle of the holy table, and while reading the word 'oblations,' as a religious ceremony took up the chalice, then being on the said holy table, and elevated it above your head."

The Dean of Arches pronounced such elevation to be illegal.—*Judgment of the Court of Arches, Elphinstone v. Purchas, Law Reports, Ecclesiastical Courts*, Vol. iii. part 1, 1869-70, p. 109.

ELEVATION OF OFFERTORY ALMS.

The Rev. John Purchas was charged that he, "during the Communion Service as officiating minister, after receiving the alms contributed at the offertory, elevated the same, and then, placing the same for a moment on the holy table, did forthwith remove the same and hand them to an acolyte or attendant, who took them away and placed them on the credence table, instead of suffering the same to remain on the holy table."

The Dean of Arches said—

I admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain for the future from doing or sanctioning the acts so charged.—*Ibid.* p. 100-101.

PROSTRATION OR KNEELING DURING THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION.

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Cairns), delivering the Judgment of the Privy Council, Dec. 28th, 1868, said—

The evidence remains that the Respondent, after commencing the Prayer of Consecration standing, paused in the middle of the prayer, knelt down, inclining or prostrating his head towards the ground, and then, rising up again, continued the prayer standing.

In order to bring the conduct of the Respondent on this head to the test of ecclesiastical law, it is proper now to turn to the Rubric of the order of the administration of the Holy Communion.

The Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration then follows, and is in these words: "When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the prayer of consecration as follows."

Their Lordships entertain no doubt on the construction of this Rubric, that the priest is intended to continue in one posture during the prayer, and not to change from standing to kneeling, or *vice-versâ*; and it appears to them equally certain that the priest is intended to stand and not to kneel. They think that the words "standing before the table" apply to the whole sentence; and they think this is made more apparent by the consideration, that acts are to be done by the priest before the people as the prayer proceeds (such as taking the paten and chalice into his hands, breaking the bread, and laying his hands on the various vessels) which could only be done in the attitude of standing.

This being, in their Lordships' opinion, the proper construction of the Rubric, it is clear that the Respondent, by the posture, or change of posture which he has adopted during the prayer, has violated the Rubric, and committed an offence within the meaning of the 13th and 14th Charles II., cap. 4, secs. 2, 17, 24, taken in connexion with the 1st of Elizabeth, cap. 2, and punishable by admonition under sec. 23 of the latter statute.

It was contended on behalf of the Respondent, that the act complained of was one of those minute details, which could not be taken to be covered by the provisions of the Rubric; that the Rubric could not be considered as exhaustive in its directions.

Their Lordships are of opinion, that it is not open to a minister of the Church, or even to their Lordships in advising Her Majesty as the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of appeal, to draw a distinction in acts, which are a departure from or violation of the Rubric, between those which are important and those which appear to be trivial. The object of a Statute of Uniformity is, as its preamble expresses, to produce "an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God," an object, which would be wholly frustrated if each minister, on his own view of the relative importance of the details of the service, were to be at liberty to omit, to add to, or to alter any of those details. The rule upon this subject has been already laid down by the Judicial Committee in "*Westerton v. Liddell*," and their Lordships are disposed entirely to adhere to it: "In the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer-Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; no omission and no addition can be permitted."

On the whole, their Lordships are of opinion that the charge against the Respondent of kneeling during the Prayer of Consecration has been sustained, and that he should be admonished, not only not to recur to the elevation of the paten and the cup as pleaded in the 3rd article, but also to abstain for the future from kneeling or prostrating himself before the consecrated elements during the Prayer of Consecration, as in the same article also pleaded.—*Privy Council Judgment, Martin v. Mackonochie, Law Reports, Privy Council Appeal Cases, Vol. ii. 1867-9, pp. 381 to 385.*

Lord Chelmsford, in the before-mentioned Judgment of the Privy Council, Nov. 25th, 1870, said—

The remaining charge to be considered against Mr. Mackonochie is, his sanctioning kneeling or prostration before the consecrated elements during the Prayer of Consecration. Their Lordships (as already mentioned) having upon the former occasion, when Mr. Mackonochie was charged with disobedience to the monition, decided that the genuflexion, which he practised, amounted to kneeling. Mr. Mackonochie, with the same object which he has always had in view, to pay only the closest literal obedience to the monition, gave notice to his curates, that he intended thenceforth to bow without bending the knee at the part of the Prayer of Consecration where he had previously knelt. This intention he and his curates carried out, according to the description given in the affidavits, by bowing down towards the table after replacing the wafer upon it, and remaining some seconds in that position; and adopting the same course with respect to the cup. Mr. Mackonochie stated that upon some of these occasions his forehead may have touched the table, but that this was no part of the act of bowing, his object being merely a low bow. Their Lordships do not regard a reverential bowing in the light of an act of prostration, as contended for by the learned counsel for the appellant; but the posture assumed and maintained for some seconds by Mr. Mackonochie is certainly not a mere bow, but a humble prostration of the body in reverence and

adoration. Their Lordships consider that the charge against Mr. Mackonochie of sanctioning prostration before the consecrated elements is therefore fully proved.—*Privy Council Judgment,* Martin v. Mackonochie*, 25 Nov., 1870, *Law Journal Reports, Ecclesiastical Cases*, Vol. xl. part 4, April, 1871, p. 7.

LIGHTED CANDLES.

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Cairns), delivering the judgment of the Privy Council, Dec. 23rd, 1868, said—

The facts, therefore, on this part of the case, appear to be that the Respondent uses two lighted candles during, with reference to and as an accompaniment of, the Communion Service, and not for the ordinary purpose of giving light, and that these candles are placed on a ledge of wood which is placed on the Communion-table.

The Dean of Arches seems to have considered, that all the practices complained of before him, including this use of lighted candles, were ceremonies. The Respondent, in the argument of his counsel at the bar, appeared to prefer to treat the question as one of ornament, and Mr. James said he considered the lighted candles "part of the symbolical decoration of the altar."

If it were necessary to decide which of these views is correct, their Lordships would feel disposed to agree with the Dean of Arches that, however candles and candlesticks may *per se* be looked upon as a part of the furniture or ornaments of the church, taking the word ornaments in the larger sense assigned to it by this Committee in *Westerton v. Liddell*" (*Moore*, p. 156), yet the lighting of the candles and the consuming them by burning throughout, and with reference to a service in which they are to act as symbols and illustrations, is itself either a ceremony, or else a ceremonial act forming part of a ceremony, and making the whole ceremony a different one from what it would have been, had the lights been omitted.

There is a clear and obvious distinction between the presence in the church of things inert and unused, and the active use of the same things as a part of the administration of a sacrament or of a ceremony. Incense, water, a banner, a torch, a candle and candlestick may be parts of the furniture or ornaments of a church: but the censuring of persons and things, or, as was said by the Dean of Arches, the bringing in incense at the beginning or during the celebration, and removing it at the close of the celebration of the Eucharist, the symbolical use of water in baptism, or its ceremonial mixing with the sacramental wine; the waving or carrying of the banner; the lighting, cremation, and symbolical use of the torch or candle: these acts give a life and meaning to what is otherwise inexpressible: and the act must be justified, if at all, as part of a ceremonial law.

If the use of lighted candles in the matter complained of be a ceremony or ceremonial act, it might be sufficient to say that it is not—nor is any ceremony in which it forms a part—among those retained in the Prayer-book, and it must therefore be included among those that are abolished; for the Prayer-book, in the preface, divides all ceremonies into these two classes; those which are retained are specified, whereas none are abolished specifically or by name, but it is assumed, that all are abolished which are not expressly retained.

As to the argument, that the use complained of is at most only part of a ceremony, their Lordships are of opinion that, when a part of a ceremony, their Lordships are of opinion that, when a part of a ceremony is changed, the integrity of the ceremony is broken and it ceases to be the same ceremony.

It remains to be considered whether the use of these two lighted candles can be justified as a question of "ornaments" according to the definition of that term already referred to. It was in this sense that the argument for the Respondent appeared to prefer to regard them; and the learned Judge of the Arches' Court also, although, at the earlier part of his judgment, he had stated that the matters complained of before him must be considered as "ceremonies," appears ultimately to have applied to the use of the lighted candles the law or Rubric as to ornaments.

* Similar Judgment in Court of Arches, *Elphinstone v. Purchas*.

The Rubric or note as to ornaments, in the commencement of the Prayer-book is in these words :—

“And here it is to be noted, that such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.”

The construction of this Rubric was very fully considered by this Committee in the case of “*Westerton v. Liddell*” already referred to ; and the propositions which their Lordships understand to have been established by the judgment in that case may thus be stated :

First.—The words “authority of Parliament” in the Rubric, refer to and mean the Act of Parliament 2d and 3d Edward VI., cap. 1, giving Parliamentary effect to the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., and do not refer to or mean canons or Royal injunctions, having the authority of Parliament made at an earlier period.—(*Moore, Special Report*, p. 160.)

Second.—The term “ornaments” in the Rubric means those articles the use of which in the services and ministrations of the Church is prescribed by that Prayer-book.—(*Ibid.* p. 156.)

Third.—The term “ornaments” is confined to these articles.—(*Ibid.* p. 156.)

Fourth.—Though there may be articles, not expressly mentioned in the Rubric, use of which would not be restrained, they must be articles which are consistent with, and subsidiary to, the services ; as an organ for the singing, a Credence-table from which to take the sacramental bread and wine, cushions, hassocks, &c.—(*Ibid.* p. 187.)

In these conclusions, and in this construction of the Rubric, their Lordships entirely concur, and they go far, in their Lordships’ opinion, to decide this part of the case.

The lighted candles are clearly not “ornaments” within the words of the Rubric, for they are not prescribed by the authority of Parliament therein mentioned—namely,—the first Prayer-book : nor is the injunction of 1547 the authority of Parliament within the meaning of the Rubric. They are not subsidiary to the service, for they do not aid or facilitate—much less are they necessary to—the service ; nor can a separate and independent ornament, previously in use, be said to be consistent with a Rubric which is silent as to it, and which by necessary implication abolishes what it does not retain.

It was strongly pressed by the Respondent’s counsel, that the use of lighted candles up to the time of the issue of the first Prayer-book was clearly legal, that the lighted candles were in use in the Church in the second year of Edward VI. ; and that there was nothing in the Prayer-book of that year making it unlawful to continue them. All this may be conceded, but it is in reality beside the question. The Rubric of our Prayer-book might have said : those ornaments shall be retained which were lawful, or which were in use in the second year of Edward VI., and the argument as to actual use at the time, and as to the weight of the injunction of 1547, might in that case have been material. But the Rubric, speaking in 1661, more than one hundred years subsequently, has, for reasons, which it is not the province of a judicial tribunal to criticize, defined the class of ornaments to be retained by a reference, not to what was in use *de facto*, or to what was lawful in 1549, but to what was in the Church by authority of Parliament in that year ; and in the Parliamentary authority, which this Committee has held, and which their Lordships hold to be indicated by these words, the ornaments in question are not found to be included.

Their Lordships have not referred to the usage as to lights during the last three hundred years ; but they are of opinion, that the very general disuse of lights after the Reformation (whatever exceptional cases to the contrary might be produced), contrasted with their normal and prescribed use previously, affords a very strong contemporaneous and continuous exposition of the law upon the subject.

Their Lordships will, therefore, humbly advise Her Majesty, that the charges as to lights also has been sustained, and that the respondent should be admonished for the future to abstain from the use of them, as pleaded in these articles.—*Privy Council Judgment, Martin v. Mackonochie, Law Reports, Privy Council Appeal Cases*, 1867-9, pp. 386 to 392.

INCENSE.

The Dean of Arches in delivering Judgment, March 28, 1868, said—

The charge against the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie as to the use of incense is twofold; and is as follows:

(a.) That he “used incense for censuring persons and things in and during the celebration of the Holy Communion, and permitted and sanctioned such use of incense.”

This mode of using incense had been discontinued before the institution of the suit.

(b) That he “unlawfully used incense in and during the celebration of the Holy Communion, and permitted and sanctioned such unlawful use of incense.”

It (incense) certainly was in use in the Church of England in the time of King Edward the Sixth’s first Prayer Book. The visitation articles of Cranmer as to forbidding the censuring to certain images, &c., supplies one of the proofs of this fact. On the other hand the use of it during the celebration of the Eucharist is not directly ordered in any prayer book, canon, injunction, formulary, or visitation article of the Church of England since the Reformation. . . .

It is not, however, necessarily subsidiary to the celebration of the Holy Communion, and it is not to be found in the rubrics of the present Prayer Book, which describe with considerable minuteness every outward act, which is to done at that time.

To bring in incense at the beginning or during the celebration, and remove it at the close of the celebration, of the Eucharist, appears to me a distinct ceremony, additional and not even indirectly incident to the ceremonies ordered by the Book of Common Prayer.

Although therefore it be an ancient, innocent, and pleasing custom, I am constrained to pronounce that the use of it by Mr. Mackonochie, in the manner specified in both charges, is illegal and must be discontinued.—*Judgment of the Court of Arches, Martin v. Mackonochie, Law Reports, Ecclesiastical Cases*, Vol. ii. 1867-9, pp. 211-215.

The Rev. John Purchas was charged that he “used incense for censuring persons and things, and for other purposes, as a matter of ceremony, in and during the celebration of the Holy Communion, and also in and during other parts of Divine Service, and there permitted and sanctioned such use of incense.”

The Dean of Arches admonished Mr. Purchas to abstain for the future from doing or sanctioning the acts so charged.—*Judgment, Court of Arches, Elphinstone v. Purchas, Law Reports, Ecclesiastical Courts*, Vol. iii. part 1, 1869-70, pp. 99 to 101.

The said Rev. John Purchas was charged that he did “cense or permit to be censed, during Divine Service, the crucifix, placed and standing on the holy table or narrow ledge.”

The Dean of Arches admonished Mr. Purchas to abstain for the future from doing or sanctioning the acts so charged.—*Ibid.* pp. 99 to 101.

MIXING WATER WITH THE SACRAMENTAL WINE USED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

The Dean of Arches, in delivering judgment, February 3, 1880, said—

I admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain for the future from doing or sanctioning the acts so charged.

Mr. Purchas was charged that “during the celebration of the Holy Communion and as part of the ceremonies thereof, mixing water with the sacramental wine used in the administration of the Holy Communion, and permitting and sanctioning such mixing and the administration to the communicants of the wine and water so mixed.”—*Extract Judgment, Court of Arches, Elphinstone v. Purchas, Ibid.* pp. 100-101.

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Hatherley, delivering the judgment of the Privy Council, Feb. 23, 1871, said—

Their Lordships now proceed to the 16th Article, which charges that, on a certain day, the defendant "administered wine mixed with water instead of wine to the communicants at the Lord's Supper." The learned judge in the Court below has decided that it is illegal to mix water with the wine at the time of the service of Holy Communion; but he decides, that water may be mixed with the wine "provided that the mingling be not made at the time of the celebration."

Their Lordships are unable to arrive at the conclusion that, if the mingling and administering in the service water and wine is an additional ceremony, and so unlawful, it becomes lawful by removing from the service the act of mingling but keeping the mingling cup itself and administering it. But neither Eastern nor Western Church, so far as the Committee is aware, has any custom of mixing the water with wine apart from and before the service.

As to the second question, the addition of water is prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1549; it has disappeared from all the later books, and this omission must have been designed. . . . These directions make it appear, that the wine has not been mingled with water, but remains the same throughout. If the wine had been mingled with water before being placed on the table, then the portion of it, that might revert to the curate, would have undergone this symbolical mixing, which cannot surely have been intended.

As the learned judge has decided that the act of mingling the water with the wine in the service is illegal, the private mingling of the wine is not likely to find favour with any. Whilst the former practice has prevailed both in the East and the West, and is of great antiquity, the latter practice has not prevailed at all; and it would be a manifest deviation from the Rubric of the Prayer Book of Edward VI. as well as from the exceptional practice and directions of Bishop Andrewes. Upon this 16th Article, however, whether it be more or less important, their Lordships allow the appeal, and will advise that a monition should issue against the defendant.—*Extract, Privy Council Judgment, Hebbert v. Purchas, Law Journal Reports, Ecclesiastical Cases, Vol. xl. part 6, June, 1871, pp. 49, 50.*

VESTMENTS.

Copes at Morning or Evening Prayer.

Albs with patches called Apparels.

Tippetts of a circular form.

Stoles, of any kind whatsoever, whether black, white, or coloured, and worn in any manner.

Dalmatics. Maniples.

The Dean of Arches, delivering judgment, Feb. 3, 1870, said—

It is unlawful, therefore, for Mr. Purchas to wear or authorize to be worn, a cope at morning or at evening prayer; albs with patches called apparels, tippetts of a circular form, stoles of any kind whatsoever, whether black, white, or coloured, and worn in any manner; dalmatics and maniples, which latter ornament, it appears from the evidence, was worn on one occasion by one of the officiating clergymen, though it does not appear that Mr. Purchas wore one himself. As to the girdle and the amice, it is not proved that Mr. Purchas wore them or suffered them to be worn.—*Extract from Judgment in Court of Arches, Elphinstone v. Purchas, Law Reports, Ecclesiastical Courts, Vol. iii. part 1, 1869-70, p. 94.*

The Chasuble.—Tunics or Tunicles.—Albs.

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Hatherley, in delivering Judgment, Feb. 23, 1871, said—

The charges, which are the subject of this appeal, are: that the respondent has offended against the statute law and the constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, . . . by himself wearing and sanctioning and authorizing the wearing by other

officiating ministers, whilst officiating in the Communion Service, and in the ministrations of the Holy Communion in the said church, a vestment called a chasuble, as pleaded in the 36th Article; and by himself wearing, and causing or suffering to be worn by other officiating clergy, when officiating in the Communion Service in the said church, certain other vestments called dalmatics, tunics or tunicles, and albs.

We find it convenient to adopt the order followed by the learned Dean of the Arches, and to examine, first, the charge of wearing and causing to be worn, a chasuble, tunics, or tunicles and albs in the celebration of the Holy Communion.

It is necessary to review shortly the history of the Rubric, usually known as "the Ornaments Rubric," which governs this question.

The first Prayer Book of King Edward VI. 1549, contains the following Rubric at the beginning of the Communion office:—

"Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry, shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white albe, plain, with a vestment or cope, and where there be many priests or deacons, then so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration as shall be requisite, and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for the ministry, that is to say, albes with tunicles."

In the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) this was altered, and it was ordered, that the minister "shall use neither albe, vestment, nor cope, but being archbishop or bishop he shall have and wear a rochet, and being a priest or deacon he shall have and wear a surplice only."

The Prayer Book of Elizabeth (A.D. 1559) provided, that "the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times of his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

This Committee has already decided (*Liddell v. Westerton*), that the words "by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." refer to the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI.

The Act of Parliament set in the beginning of Elizabeth's book is Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, and the 25th clause of that Act contains a proviso, "that such ornaments of the Church and the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use, as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the Commissioners as appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England, for causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm."

The Prayer Book therefore refers to the Act, and the Act clearly contemplated further directions to be given by the Queen, with the advice of Commissioners or of the Metropolitan.

In the year 1564 appeared the Advertisements of Elizabeth. They make order for the vesture of the minister in these words:—"In the ministration of the Holy Communion now in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister shall use a cope, with gospeler and epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at the said Communion Table to use no copes but surplices. That every minister, saying any public prayers or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." (Cardwell, Doc. An. I. 396.)

These Advertisements were very actively enforced within a few years of their publication. An inventory of the ornaments of 150 parishes in the Diocese of Lincoln, A.D. 1565-1566, has been published by Mr. Edward Peacock; and it shews, that the chasubles or vestments and the albs, were systematically defaced, destroyed, or put to other uses, and a precise account was rendered of the mode of their destruction. Proceedings took place under Commissions in Lancashire in 1565 and 1570; in Carlisle in 1573 and following years, when "vestments seem to have disappeared altogether." (Rev. J. Raine, "Vestments," London, 1866.) There is no reason to doubt, that all through the country Commissions were issued to enforce the observance of the Advertisements within a few years after they were drawn up.

These, then, are the leading historical facts with which we have to deal in the difficult task of construing the Rubric of Ornaments. The vestment or cope, alb, and tunicle were ordered by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. They were abolished by the Prayer Book of 1552, and the surplice was substituted. They were provisionally restored by the statute of Elizabeth, and by her Prayer Book of 1559. But the injunctions and the Advertisements of Elizabeth established a new order within a few years from the passing of the statute, under which chasuble, albe, and tunicle disappeared. The canons of 1603-4, adopting anew the reference to the Rubric of Edward VI., sanctioned in express terms all that the Advertisements had done in the matter of the vestments, and ordered the surplice only to be used in parish churches. The revisers of our present Prayer Book in 1662, under another form of words, repeated the reference to the second year of Edward VI., and they did so advisedly, after attention being called to the possibility of a return to the vestments.

Their Lordships think that the defacing and destroying, and converting to profane and other uses of all the vestments now in question, as described in the Lincoln MS. published by Mr. Peacock, shew a determination to remove utterly these ornaments, and not to leave them to be used hereafter when higher Ritual might become possible.

In order to decide the question before the Committee, it seems desirable first to examine the effect of the Church legislation of 1603-4. The 14th Canon orders the use of the Prayer Book without omission or innovation, and the 80th Canon directs that copies of the Prayer Book are to be provided, in its lately revised form, and, by implication, the Ornaments Rubric is thus made binding on the clergy. Canon 24th directs the use of the cope in cathedral and collegiate churches upon principal feast days, "according to the Advertisements for this end, anno 7 Elizabeth." Canon 58th says that "every Minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." There can be no doubt that the intention here was not to set up a contradictory rule, by prescribing vestments in the Prayer Book and a surplice in the Canons which give authority to the Prayer Book. It could not be intended, in recognizing the legal force of the Advertisements, to bring back the things which the Advertisements had taken away: nor could it be expected, that either the minister or the people should provide vestments in lieu of those which had been destroyed, and accordingly no direction is given with regard to them. The provisions of the Canons and Prayer Book must be read together, as far as possible; and the Canons upon the vesture of the ministers must be held to be an exposition of and limitation of the Rubric of Ornaments. Such ornaments are to be used as were in use in the second year of Edward VI., limited as to the vestments by the special provisions of the Canons themselves; and the contemporaneous exposition of universal practice shew, that this was regarded as the meaning of the Canons. There does not appear to have been any return to the vestments in any quarter whatever.

But whether this be so or not, their Lordships are of opinion, that as the Canons of 1603-4, which in one part seemed to revive the vestments, and in another to order the surplice for all ministrations, ought to be construed together; so that the Act of Uniformity is to be construed with the two canons on this subject, which it did not repeal, and that the result is, that the cope is to be worn in ministering the Holy Communion on high feast days in cathedrals, and collegiate churches, and the surplice in all other ministrations. Their Lordships attach great weight to the abundant evidence, which now exists that from the days of Elizabeth to about 1840 the practice is uniformly in accordance with this view; and is irreconcilable with either of the other views. Through the researches that have been referred to in these remarks, a clear and abundant *expositio contemporanea* has been supplied, which compensates for the scantiness of some other materials for a Judgment.

It is quite true, that neither contrary practice nor disuse can repeal the positive enactment of a statute, but contemporaneous and continuous usage is of the greatest efficacy in law for determining the true construction of obscurely framed documents.

Their Lordships will advise Her Majesty, that the defendant Mr. Purchas has

offended against the Laws Ecclesiastical in wearing the chasuble, alb and tunicle; and that a monition shall issue against the defendant accordingly.—*Extract from Privy Council Judgment, Hebbert v. Purchas, Law Journal Reports, Ecclesiastical Cases, Vol. xl. part 6, new series, June, 1871, pp. 39 to 48.*

The question of Vestments so far as regards the Albe and Chasuble, decided in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, was allowed to be re-argued before the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the Appeal of the Reverend C. J. Ridsdale *v.* Clifton and others, from an Order of the Judge as Official Principal of the Arches Court of Canterbury, in which he followed the previous Judgment. Their Lordships gave Judgment on the 12th May, 1877, confirming the decision appealed against. The Lord Chancellor (Cairns) in delivering the Judgment said:

"The conclusion drawn by this Committee in *Hebbert v. Purchas*, that the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth on this subject had the force of law under 1 Elizabeth, cap. 2, section 25, appears to their Lordships to be not only warranted, but irresistible. . . .

"Reading, then, as their Lordships consider they were bound to do, the order as to vestures in the Book of Advertisements, into the 25th section of the 1st of Elizabeth, cap. 2, and omitting (for the sake of brevity) all reference to hoods, it will appear that that section, from the year 1566 to 1662, had the same operation in law as if it had been expressed in these words: "Provided always that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI., except that the surplice shall be used by the ministers of the Church at all times of their public ministrations, and the alb, vestment or tunicle shall not be used, nor shall a cope be used except at the administration of the Holy Communion in cathedral and collegiate churches."

Their Lordships, after delivering a very long Judgment, concluded thus—

"For these reasons, which, out of respect for the elaborate arguments so earnestly addressed to them, and not from any hesitation as to the decision at which they should arrive, they have expressed at a length greater than is usual, are of opinion that the decision of the learned Judge of the Arches Court as to the vestments worn by the Appellant, following that of this Committee in *Hebbert v. Purchas*, is correct, and ought to be affirmed."—[*Official Copy of the Judgment of the Privy Council in Ridsdale v. Clifton*, pp. 18 and 37.]

The decision of the Judge of the Arches Court was as follows:—

"I must therefore hold that Mr. Ridsdale has offended against the law in celebrating the Communion in a Chasuble and in an Albe, and admonish him to refrain from doing so in future."

WAFER BREAD.

The Rev. John Purchas was charged with using "wafer bread, being bread made in the special shape and fashion of circular wafer instead of bread such as is usual to be eaten," and with administering the same to the communicants.

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Hatherley, in delivering Judgment, Feb. 23, 1871, said—

It is at least worthy of notice, that when Cosin and others at the last revision desired to insert the words making the wafer also lawful, these words were rejected.

But their Lordships attach greater weight to the exposition of this Rubric furnished by the history of the question. From a large collection of Visitation Articles, from the time of Charles II., it is clear that the best and purest wheat bread was to be provided for the Holy Communion, and no other kind of bread. They believe, that from that time till about 1840 the practice of using the usual wheat bread was universal.

The words of the 20th Canon, to which the Visitation Articles refer, point the same way. The churchwardens are bound to supply "wheaten bread," and this alone is mentioned. If wafer bread is equally permitted, or the special cakes of Edward VI.'s first Book and of the injunctions, it is hard to see why the parish is to supply wheaten bread, in cases where wafers are to be supplied by the minister or from some other source. And if wafers were to be in use, a general injunction to all churchwardens to supply wheaten bread would be quite inapplicable to all churches, where there should be another usage.

Upon the whole, their Lordships think, that the law of the Church has directed the use of pure wheaten bread, and they must so advise Her Majesty.—*Extract, Privy Council Judgment, Hebbert v. Purchas*, ibid. pp. 50, 51.

The question as to wafer-bread decided in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, was allowed to be re-argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Ridsdale v. Clifton*. The following is an extract from that Judgment—

Their Lordships will now proceed to the charge as to wafers or wafer-bread.

The charge as to this is, "that the Appellant used in the Communion Service and administration wafer-bread or wafers, to wit, bread or flour made in the form of circular wafers instead of bread such as is usual to be eaten." And this is traversed by the Appellant.

It is to be observed that the Rubric does not in any part of it use the term "wafer." The words are "bread:" "bread such as is usual to be eaten," and "the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten."

Their Lordships have no doubt that a wafer, in the sense in which the word is usually employed, that is, as denoting a composition of flour and water rolled very thin and unleavened, is not "bread such as is usual to be eaten," or "the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten."

The practice of using fine wheat bread such as is usual to be eaten, and not cake or wafer, appears to have been universal throughout the Church of England from the alteration of the Rubric in 1662, till 1840, or later.

Their Lordships think that if it had been averred and proved that the wafer, properly so called, had been used by the Appellant, it would have been illegal, but as the averment and proof is insufficient, they will advise an alteration of the Decree in this respect.—*Official Copy of the Judgment of the Privy Council in Ridsdale v. Clifton*, pp. 44, 45, 48.

Bells—Agnus Dei in wrong part of Service.

The Rev. John Purchas was charged with having "caused a small bell to be rung divers times during the Prayer of Consecration in the service of the Holy Communion, such ringing being simultaneous and connected with the consecration of the elements, and with the elevation of them, as in the preceding Articles mentioned."

And also with having "caused to be said or sung, before the reception of the elements and immediately after the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Service, the words or hymn or prayer commonly known as 'The Agnus,' that is to say:—'O Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, have mercy on us;' which said words are appointed to be said only as a part of the said hymn or prayer at the conclusion of the said service, namely, after the reception of the elements by the communicants is completely ended, and after the Lord's Prayer and the other prayer then appointed and the Gloria have been said, and immediately before the final blessing."

On both points the Dean of Arches said,

I think these Articles are substantially proved; and that in these circumstances the additional rites or ceremonies must be considered as illegal, on the principle of the decision in *Martin v. Mackonochie*; and I accordingly admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain from the use or sanction of the particular rites and ceremonies so charged for the future.—*Extract, Judgment Court of Arches, Elphinstone v. Purchas, Law Reports, Ecclesiastical Courts*, Vol. iii. part 1, 1869-70, pp. 98-99.

Sign of the Cross.—Kissing the Gospel Book.

The Rev. John Purchas was charged that "during the saying of the Apostles' creed and Nicene creed, and at the pronouncing of the Absolution in the order for Holy Communion, and at the giving of the elements to the communicants, and during the pronouncing of the Benediction, after the sermon, and on certain other occasions.....when about to mix water with the wine, and when about to consecrate the same, you, being then the officiating minister, made the sign of the cross by the appropriate gesture for that purpose, the same being intended as and constituting a ceremony.

And further that "you being present, and responsible for the due performance of Divine Service during the Communion Service, directed, caused, or permitted and sanctioned a certain clergyman then assisting you in the performance of Divine Service by reading the Gospel for the day, to kiss the book from which he read the Gospel, such kissing of the book being intended as and constituting a matter of ceremony, the said book during such reading of the Gospel, being in a ceremonial manner held before him by a deacon or attendant."

The Dean of Arches said—

The ruling of the Privy Council in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*, with respect to the kneeling of the priest during the Communion Service, seems to me to apply to the acts of devotion complained of in these articles, which I must therefore pronounce illegal.—*Ibid.* pp. 108, 109.

Leaving the Holy Table uncovered on Good Friday.

The said Rev. John Purchas was charged, that "on Good Friday, 1869, when there was no administration of the Holy Communion, caused or permitted the holy table to be and remain during Divine Service without any decent covering, such as is enjoined and required by the 82nd Canon of the Church."

The Dean of Arches said—

The leaving of the holy table wholly bare and uncovered during Divine Service is, I believe, a practice without warrant from primitive use or custom; but it is certainly contrary to the 82nd Canon, which governs this question, and is therefore illegal.—*Ibid.* p. 107.

POSITIONS.

Standing in front of the Holy Table with back to the people during the Prayer of Consecration.

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Hatherley, in delivering the Judgment of the Privy Council, Feb. 23, 1871, said—

It remains to consider part of the 17th article of charge, which sets out that the respondent during the whole of the Prayer of Consecration at the Holy Communion "stood at the middle of that side of the holy table, which, if the said holy table stood at the east end of the said church or chapel (the said table in St. James' Chapel, in fact, standing at the west end thereof), would be the west side of such table, in such wise that you stood between the people and the said holy table, with your back to the people, so that the people could not see you break the bread or take the cup into your hand." The learned judge deals with this charge very briefly, believing it to have been settled by the judgment in *Martin v. Mackonochie*. He says, "I must observe, that the Rubric does not require the people should see the breaking of the bread, or the taking of the cup into the priest's hand; and if it did so prescribe, the evidence in this case would establish that all the congregation could see him take the cup into his hand, and some of them at least could see him break the bread." The Rubric on this point is this: "When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth." Their Lordships are of opinion that these words mean that the priest is so to stand that the people present may see him break the bread and take the cup into his

hands ; although the learned judge is right if he means to say that the mere words do not speak of seeing.

Their Lordships think, that the evidence of the witness Verrall, which there is no reason to doubt, proves that "generally the congregation could not see" the breaking of the bread, because the respondent had his back turned to them. As regards the cup, the witness said that they could see him take the cup into his hand, but being asked further, he says, "I could tell he was taking the cup into his hand." This is consistently explained by supposing, that the witness and others could see a certain motion of the respondent, which from their knowledge of the service and from the subsequent elevation they were sure was the taking of the cup into his hands. It would probably be impossible in any position so to act, that all the congregation could see or that all should be unable to see ; but we take it as proved, that the greater part of the congregation could not see the breaking of the bread or the act of taking the cup into the hands.

The facts being established, their Lordships proceed to consider the question itself. In default of argument on the respondent's side, they have been somewhat aided by a large mass of controversial literature, which shews how much interest this question excites, and which has probably left few of the facts unnoticed.

The Rubric upon the position of the table directs, that it shall "stand in the body of the church or in the chancel, where morning and evening prayer are appointed to be said." This is the same as the Rubric of 1552, 1559, and 1604, excepting the verbal alteration of *are* for *be*. It goes on, "And the priest standing at the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer with the Collect following." The table is a moveable table. By the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth (Cardwell, Doc. Annals I, p. 210) it is ordered, "that the holy table in every church be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly covered as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the visitors, and so to stand, saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministrations, and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the said minister. And after the Communion is done from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before." If this custom still prevailed of bringing the table from the east and placing it in the chancel, the two Rubrics would present no difficulty. The priest standing on the north side as directed by the one, would also be standing before the table, so as to break the bread before the people and take the cup into his hand as required by the other. No direction was given for a change of position in the Prayer of Consecration in the second book of King Edward VI., but only a change of posture in the words, "standing up." But before the time of the Revision of 1662, the custom of placing the table along the east wall was becoming general, and it may fairly be said that the revisers must have had this in view.

The following questions appear to require an answer, in order to dispose of this part of the case : What is meant by the "north side of the table?" What change, if any, is ordered by the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration? And what is the meaning of "before the people" in that Rubric?

As to the first question, their Lordships are of opinion that "north side of the table" means that side which looks towards the north.

They have considered some ingenious arguments intended to prove, that "north side" means that part of the west side that is nearest to the north. One of these is, that the middle of the altar before the Reformation was occupied by a stone or slab called *mensa consecratoria* and *sigillum altaris*, that the part of the altar north of this was called north side, and that to the south of it was called the south side. Without enquiring whether English altars were generally so constructed, which is to say the least doubtful, their Lordships observe that in the directions for the substitution of a moveable table for the altar and for its decent covering, and its position at various times, there is no hint, that this is to revive this peculiarity of the altar which it replaced ; and they do not believe, that the table was so arranged or divided.

Another argument is drawn from the Jewish Ritual. On offering sacrifices before the Lord, the altar was to be sprinkled with the blood, and a red line was drawn across the altar to mark the height at which it should be sprinkled ; and

it is argued that the line being only in front, the priest must have stood in front in order to see it and be guided by it. But on the other hand the line probably went all round the altar, and the sprinkling was applied to all the sides. And even if the fact was rightly stated, it would be impossible to allow an argument so remote and shadowy to supersede the plain sense of a direction so clear in itself. When the table was placed in the body of the church or chancel, the priest or minister was to stand on the north side of it, looking south.

When it became the custom to place the table altarwise against the east wall the Rubric remained the same. And there are many authorities to shew that the position of the minister was still upon the north side or end, facing south. It is only necessary to cite a few. Archdeacon Pory (1662), in his Visitation Articles, says, "The minister standing, as he is appointed, at the north side or the end of the table when he celebrates the Holy Communion." In the dispute between the Vicar of Grantham and his parishioners (1627), Bishop Williams plainly shews, that whichever way the table was to stand, which was the matter in dispute, the position of the minister was on the north. "If you mean by altarwise, that the table shall stand along close by the wall, so that you be forced to officiate at one end thereof (as you may have observed in great men's chapels), I do not believe that ever the Communion tables were otherwise than by casualty so placed in country churches." He also says, "I conceive the alteration was made in the Rubric to shew which way the celebrant was to face." (Heylin, "Coale from the Altar," and Williams, "Holy Table.") Heylin says, quoting the Latin Prayer Book of 1560, "I presume that no man of reason can deny, but that the northern end or side, call it which you will, is *pars septentrionalis*, the northern part." ("Coale from the Altar.") When Bishop Wren was impeached in the House of Lords, A.D. 1636, for consecrating the elements on the west side of the table, he answered that he stood on the north side at all the rest of the service except at the Prayer of Consecration. "He humbly conceiveth it is a plain demonstration, that he came to the west side only for the more conveniency of executing his office, and no way at all in any superstition, much less in any imitation of the Romish priests, for they place themselves there at all the service before and at all after, with no less strictness than at the time of consecrating the bread and wine." Nicholls (Commentary on Common Prayer, published 1710), Bennett (Annotations on Book of Common Prayer, 1708) Wheatley (Rational Illustrations of Common Prayer, 1710), confirm the view, that, when the table was placed east and west, the minister's position was still on the north.

Their Lordships entertain no doubt whatever, that when the table was set at the east end the direction to stand at the north side was understood to apply to the north end, and that this was the practice of the Church.

It will be convenient to consider next, what is the meaning of the words "before the people," in the Rubric before the Consecration Prayer. Nicholls observes:—"To say the Consecration Prayer (in the recital of which the bread is broken) standing before the table, is not to break the bread before the people, for then the people cannot have a view thereof, which our wise Reformers, upon very good reasoning, ordered that they should." That stress was laid on this witness of the people of the act of breaking, appears by other passages; for example, Udall says—"We press the action of breaking the bread against the papist. To what end if not that the beholders might thereby be led unto the breaking the body of Christ." (Communion Comeliness, 1641.) Wheatley says—"Whilst the priest is ordering the bread and wine he is to stand before the table; but when he says the prayer he is to stand so that he may with more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, which must be on the north side. For if he stood before the table, his body would hinder the people from seeing, so that he must not stand there, and, consequently, he must stand on the north side, there being in our present Rubric no other place for the performance of any part of this office."

Their Lordships consider, that the defendant, in standing with his back to the people, disobeyed the Rubric in preventing the people from seeing the breaking of the bread.

The north side being the proper place for the minister throughout the Communion office, and also whilst he is saying the Prayer of Consecration, the question remains, whether the words "standing before the table" direct any temporary change of position in the minister before saying the Prayer of Consecration?

This is not the most important but it is the most difficult question. One opinion is that of Wheatley, quoted above, that the Rubric sends the Priest to the west side of the table to order the elements, and recalls him for the prayer itself. This, however, would be needless if the elements were so placed on the table, as that the priest could, "with readiness and decency," order them from the north side, as is often done.

It would also be needless in any case, where the Communion table was placed in the body of the church or in the chancel with its ends east and west. And though this position is not likely now to be adopted, the question is whether that was the law at the time this Rubric was drawn. Now the Rubric prescribes, that the table shall stand "in the body of the church or in the chancel where morning and evening prayers are appointed to be said;" and there are two cases, which occurred in 1663, those of Crayford (Cardwell, Doc. Annals, ii, 226) and St. Gregory's London (Ibid. ii. 237), which shew that the table, though placed at the east end, might be moved for convenience' sake and under competent authority. This, too, is the view of Bishop Wren in 1636 (Ibid. ii. 252) "That the Communion table in every church do always stand close under the east wall of the chancel, the ends thereof north and south, unless the ordinary gave particular directions otherwise." Should the table be placed with its ends east and west, it would be absurd to enforce a rule that the priest should go to the west end to order the elements, seeing the north side would be in every way more convenient.

Upon these facts their Lordships incline to think, that the Rubric was purposely framed so as not to direct or insist on a change of position in the minister, which might be needless; though it does not direct a change of posture from kneeling to standing. The words are intended to set the minister free for the moment from the general direction to stand at the north side, for the special purpose of ordering the elements; but whether for this purpose he would have to change the side or not is not determined, as it would depend upon the position of the table in the church or chancel, and on the position in which the elements were placed on the table at first. They think, that the main object of this part of the Rubric is the ordering of the elements; and that the words "before the table" do not necessarily mean "between the table and the people," and are not intended to limit to any side.

The learned judge in the Court below, in considering the charge against the defendant, that he stood with his back to the people during the Prayer of Consecration, briefly observes "the question appears to me to have been settled by the Privy Council in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*." The question before their Lordships in that case was as to the posture and not as to the position of the minister. The words of the judgment are: "Their Lordships entertain no doubt on the construction of this Rubric" [before the Prayer of Consecration] "that the priest is intended to continue in one posture during the prayer, and not to change from standing to kneeling, or *vice versa*; and it appears to them equally certain, that the priest is intended to stand and not to kneel. They think that the words 'standing before the table' apply to the whole sentence; and they think this is made more apparent by the consideration, that acts are to be done by the priest before the people as the prayer proceeds (such as taking the paten and chalice into his hands, breaking the bread, and laying his hand on the various vessels) which could only be done in the attitude of standing."

This passage refers to posture or attitude from beginning to end, and not to position with reference to the sides of the table. And it could not be construed to justify Mr. Purchas in standing with his back to the people, unless a material addition were made to it. The learned judge reads it as if it ran, "They think that the words standing before the table apply to the whole sentence, and that before the table means between the table and the people on the west side." But these last words are mere assumption. The question of position was not before their Lordships; if it had been, no doubt the passage would have been conceived differently, and the question of position expressly settled.

Upon the whole then, their Lordships think, that the words of Archdeacon, afterwards Bishop, Cosin in A.D. 1627 express the state of the law, "Doth he [the minister] stand at the north side of the table, and perform all things there; but when he hath special cause to remove from it, as in reading or preaching upon the Gospel or in delivering the Sacrament to the communicants, or other occasions

of the like nature." (Bishop Cosin's Correspondence. Part I, p. 106. Surtees Society.) They think that the Prayer of Consecration is to be used at the north side of the table, so that the minister looks south, whether a broader or a narrower side of the table be towards the north.

It is mentioned that Mr. Purchas' chapel does not stand in the usual position; and that, in fact, he occupied the east side when he stood with his back towards the people. If it happened, as it does in one of the Chapels Royal, that the north side had been where the west side usually is, a question between the letter and spirit of the Rubrics would have arisen. But the defendant seems to us to have departed, both from the letter and the spirit of the Rubrics; and our advice to Her Majesty will be, that a monition should issue to him as to this charge also.—*Judgment of Privy Council, Hebbert v. Purchas, Law Journal Reports, Vol. xl. part 6, of new series, 1 June, 1871; Ecclesiastical Cases, pp. 51-55.*

This decision was allowed to be reconsidered in the case of *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, and the following alteration was made:

Their Lordships will now proceed to consider the charge against the Appellant with reference to his position during the Prayer of Consecration.

If it were necessary that there should be extracted from the Rubrics a rule governing the position of the minister throughout the whole Communion office, where no contrary direction is given or necessarily implied, the rule could not, in their Lordships' opinion, be any other than that laid down in *Hebbert v. Purchas*, and they entertain no doubt that the position which would be required by that rule—a position, namely, in which the minister would stand at the north side of the Table, looking to the south—is not only lawful, but is that which would, under ordinary circumstances, enable the minister, with the greatest certainty and convenience, to fulfil the requirements of all the Rubrics.

Their Lordships are of opinion that the words "before the people," coupled with the direction as to the manual acts, are meant to be equivalent to "in the sight of the people." They have no doubt that the Rubric requires the manual acts to be so done, that, in a reasonable and practical sense, the Communicants, especially if they are conveniently placed for receiving of the Holy Sacrament, as is presupposed in the office, may be witnesses of, that is, may see them. What is ordered to be done before the people, when it is the subject of the sense, not of hearing, but of sight, cannot be done before them unless those of them who are properly placed for that purpose can see it. It was contended that "before the people" meant nothing more than "in the church;" to guard against an anterior and secret consecration of the elements. But if the words "before the people" were absent, the manual acts, and the rest of the service, could not be performed elsewhere than in the church, and in that sense *coram populo*, nor could the Sacrament be distributed except in the place and at the time of its consecration; and the argument would, therefore, reduce to silence the words "before the people," which are an emphatic part of the declaration of the purpose for which the preparatory acts are to be done. That declaration applies not to the service as a whole, nor to the consecration of the elements as a whole, but to the manual acts separately and specifically.

There is, therefore, in the opinion of their Lordships, a rule sufficiently intelligible to be derived from the directions which are contained in the Rubric as to the acts which are to be performed. The minister is to order the elements "standing before the Table;" words which, whether the Table stands "altarwise" along the east wall, or in the body of the church or chancel, would be fully satisfied by his standing on the north side and looking towards the south; but which also, in the opinion of their Lordships, as the Tables are now usually, and in their opinion lawfully, placed, authorize him to do those acts standing on the west side and looking towards the east. Beyond this and after this there is no specific direction that, during this prayer, he is to stand on the west side, or that he is to stand on the north side. He must, in the opinion of their Lordships, stand so that he may, in good faith, enable the Communicants present, or the bulk of them, being properly placed, to see, if they wish it, the breaking of the bread, and the performance of the other manual acts mentioned. He must not interpose his body as intentionally to defeat the object of the Rubric and to prevent this

result. It may be difficult in particular cases to say exactly whether this rule has been complied with; but where there is good faith the difficulty ought not to be a serious one; and it is, in the opinion of their Lordships, clear that a protection was in this respect intended to be thrown around the body of the Communicants, which ought to be secured to them by an observance of the plain intent of the Rubric.—*Official copy of the Judgment of the Privy Council in Ridsdale v. Clifton*, pp. 38, 40, 41, 42.

Standing in front of the middle of the Holy Table with back to the people while reading the Collects next before the Epistle.

The Rev. John Purchas was charged that "you directed, sanctioned, or permitted a certain other clergyman, then officiating for you, in the presence of you, the said Rev. John Purchas, to read the collects next before the Epistle for the day in the Communion Service, standing in front of the middle of the Holy Table, with his back to the people; and that on a certain other occasion you, the said John Purchas, read such collects yourself, standing with your back to the people."

The Dean of Arches said—

As to this charge the proof is, that both Mr. Purchas and the assistant clergyman on the several occasions stood before the Holy Table with their backs to the people. It is not proved that the assistant clergyman, on the occasion mentioned, stood before the people. The rubric, which governs the position of the minister at this period of the service, is the one preceding the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of the Communion Service:—"And the priest, standing at the north side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with the collect following, the people kneeling;" and, after the interval of the Ten Commandments, the rubric enjoins the priest "to stand as before." I am aware that learned persons hold that these words, "the north side," mean "the north side of the table's front," and possibly they do so; but, in the absence of any argument before me to this effect, I think I must take the *prima facie* meaning of the rubric, and consider it as the north side of the whole table; and upon this ground I must decide against Mr. Purchas upon this Article.—*Judgment of Ct. of Arches, Elphinstone v. Purchas, Law Reports, Ecclesiastical Courts*, Vol. iii. part 1, 1869-70, p. 110.

Standing at the foot of the Holy Table with back to the people, while reading the Collects after the Creed at Evening Prayer.
Standing with back to the people, while reading the Epistle.

The Dean of Arches said—

Two charges are contained in that part of the 19th Article to which I have not as yet referred:

(a.) "And that . . . on Sunday evening . . . , you, the said Rev. John Purchas, did . . . while reading the collects following the creed, stand in front of the middle of the Holy Table at the foot of the steps leading up to the same, with your back to the people:"

(b.) "And that . . . you, the said Rev. John Purchas, directed, sanctioned, or permitted the Epistle in the Communion Service to be read in your presence by a minister standing with his back to the people."

The Dean of Arches gave the following decision—

The first offence appears to me plainly contrary to the rubric; and the second, though perhaps not governed by any positive order in a rubric, is obviously contrary to the intent of the Prayer Book, the Epistle not being a prayer addressed to God, but a portion of the Scriptures read to the people.—*Ibid.* pp 110, 111.

Minister attended by Acolytes and a person holding a Crucifix while reading the Gospel.

Te Deum, sung at the Communion Table, immediately after Evening Service, with Crucifix and banners about the minister.

The Dean of Arches said—

The following Articles, which I have grouped together, contain charges against

Mr. Purchas for using, during the time of, or so immediately connected with, the prescribed services, as to be practically undistinguishable from it, rites or ceremonies other than and additional to those prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer:—

“V. That . . . you, the said Rev. John Purchas, caused a group of acolytes, or attendants, to stand or kneel round you, and a person called the crucifer to stand by the side of you, bearing a crucifix or gilt cross, with the figure of the Saviour thereon, as a matter of ceremony during the reading by you, the said Rev. John Purchas, of the Gospel in the Communion Service; that on certain other occasions . . . the ‘Te Deum’ being on each of such occasions sung as a part of evening service immediately after the evening prayers, in the said church or chapel of St. James’s, Brighton, aforesaid, the congregation remaining in the said church or chapel during the singing thereof, you, the said Rev. John Purchas, during the singing thereof, caused the said crucifer, with his said crucifix, and the bearers of banners, to stand holding the same as a matter of ceremony near to you, the said Rev. John Purchas, and in front of the holy table.”

I think these Articles are substantially proved; and that in these circumstances the additional rites or ceremonies must be considered as illegal, on the principle of the decision in *Martin v. Mackonochie*; and I accordingly admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain from the use or sanction of the particular rites and ceremonies so charged for the future.—*Ibid.* pp. 97 to 99.

PROCESSIONS.

A Procession, immediately before or after Service, singing a hymn, and composed of—Thurifer, carrying and swinging incense; Crucifer, with Crucifix; Acolytes, with lighted candles; Deacons or others with banners; Choristers, dressed in red and white; Ceremoniarius, in cassock and cotta, with blue tippet; Rulers of the Choir, in copes; Clergy, in copes.

Palms, Lighted Candles and Crucifix, carried in procession at and as a Ceremony connected with Divine Service.

Blessing of, and giving to the people, Palms on Palm Sunday.

The Dean of Arches said—

There are various charges relating to particular kinds of processions organised by Mr. Purchas in his church, which I will now deal with; they are to be found in the following articles:—

“IV. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, on several occasions, . . . immediately before, but at the hour appointed for the commencement of the prayers appointed to be read at morning and evening service respectively, and *without any break or interval, and as connected with and being the beginning of and a part of the rites and ceremonies of public worship on the said several occasions*, in the presence of the congregation then assembled in the said church or chapel of St. James’s, Brighton, for the purpose of hearing divine service, formed, or caused to be formed, a procession composed of a thurifer carrying an incense-vessel containing incense, swinging the same; a crucifer bearing a crucifix, or a large cross, with a figure of the Saviour thereon; two acolytes, or boys dressed in red and white, with red skullcaps on their heads and bearing lighted candles; several deacons, or other persons, bearing one or more silk banners, with a cross or other device embroidered on each of such banners; divers choristers dressed in red and white; a person, called a ceremoniarius, in cassock and cotta, with blue tippet; two persons, called rulers of the choir, in copes; you, the said Rev. John Purchas, and the other officiating ministers of the day, in copes: that the procession so formed proceeded round the said church or chapel of St. James’s, singing a certain hymn, being No. 100 of the hymns contained in a book called ‘Words of the Hymnal Noted,’ or some other hymn from the same book; and that, immediately on the return of each of such processions on each of the said several occasions to the choir, the prayers for the day were commenced; and that on a certain other occa-

sion, to wit, on Sunday, February the 28th, 1869, immediately after the benediction at evening service, and *without any break or interval, and as connected with and forming the conclusion of and part of the rites and ceremonies of public worship*, formed, or caused to be formed, a like procession to the one immediately hereinbefore mentioned, and proceeded therewith round the said church, singing as aforesaid in the presence of the congregation assembled."

"XIV. *That you then,*"—that is, after doing certain acts, which fall under another category, and which I will consider presently,—"*formed or caused to be formed a procession*, consisting of a thurifer with his incense-vessel containing incense, the crucifer with a large crucifix, acolytes or boys with lighted candles, the person called ceremoniarus, an assistant minister, and you, the Rev. John Purchas, in a cope, followed by several members of the congregation each with a lighted candle; that the procession so formed proceeded round the interior of the said church or chapel singing; that thereupon afterwards you, the said Rev. John Purchas, took off your cope, and wearing a white alb with gold stole and chasuble, proceeded to the Communion Table and, after being yourself censured, commenced the Communion Service, during the reading of which the congregation extinguished their candles. That after the collect and epistle had been read the said candles were, during the reading of the Gospel, again lighted and were then again extinguished; each of the Acts in this article hereinbefore set forth, being of the nature of and intended by you as and constituting a religious ceremony."

"XXVI. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said church or chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on the Sunday next before Easter, March the 21st, 1869, at Morning Service, and during or immediately after the conclusion of morning prayer, and before the commencement of the Communion Service, sprinkled or caused to be sprinkled with so-called holy water, and blessed or consecrated, or caused to be blessed or consecrated, and censured, or caused to be censured, divers palm branches then lying on a table placed near to the Communion Table, and that after the said morning prayer was concluded you caused the said palm branches to be distributed to yourself and to divers other clerks in holy orders, to persons of the choir and members of the congregation then and there present in the said church or chapel; and that *you then caused to be formed a procession* in the said church or chapel, with a crucifix borne before it, and consisting of the thurifer, choristers, priests, and others, which said procession then proceeded round the interior of the said church or chapel, chanting, and elevating the said palm branches and accompanied with lighted candles; and that on the return of the procession, the Communion Service was immediately commenced and proceeded with, the whole taking place in the presence of the congregation then assembled to hear Divine Service as a part of Divine Service, and as a ceremony connected therewith, without break or intermission."

It appears to me from the evidence that these particular processions have been so conducted as to constitute a further rite or ceremony in connection with the morning and evening service, and in addition to those prescribed by the rubrics for those services. I must therefore, placing them under this category, pronounce them illegal.—*Ibid.* pp. 95-97.

Blessing of, and giving to the people, Ashes on Ash Wednesday,
Candles on the day of the Purification of the Virgin Mary
(Candlemas Day).

The following charges were made—

"XIII. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, did, on Ash Wednesday, at morning service, immediately after the conclusion of the Communion, and before commencing the Communion Service (you being then the officiating minister), proceed, as a matter of ceremony in connection with the Divine Service of the day, to take from the holy table a certain vessel, previously placed thereon, filled with a black powder, being or resembling ashes; and did then bless or consecrate the same, and did then rub a portion of such powder on the foreheads of certain persons, members of the congregation, who then knelt before you for that purpose (to wit, certain other clergymen then present, the person called the ceremoniarus, a person called a ruler of the choir, and certain acolytes, or boys); and did further then publicly invite any other members of the congregation to come forward for the

like purpose ; after which, none others having come forward, the Communion Service was commenced and proceeded with."

"XIV. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, on the day of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, in the morning, and when no artificial light was necessary during the performance of divine service, to wit, whilst the Litany was being read, censed or caused to be censed, afterwards sprinkled or caused to be sprinkled with holy water, or water previously blessed or consecrated, a number of candles then placed and being on a small table close to the Communion Table, and that you then, after the Litany was finished and before the commencement of the Communion Service, lighted the said candles and distributed them to divers members of the congregation, who then, by your direction or sanction, held up the same so lighted."

The Dean of Arches said—

I think these Articles are substantially proved ; and that in these circumstances the additional rites or ceremonies must be considered as illegal, on the principle of the decision in *Martin v. Mackonochie* ; and I accordingly admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain from the use or sanction of the particular rites and ceremonies so charged for the future.—*Ibid.* pp. 97-99.

Candles lighted when not wanted for the purpose of giving light, and used in any of the ways following—Carried on Candlemas Day and Whit Sunday ; used at reading of the Gospel ; placed on the Communion Table or on a ledge over it, and seeming to be part of it, or about or before the Communion Table, either during the Communion Service or other parts of the Morning Service ; Paschal light at Easter.

The specific charges were—

"X. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said church or chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on divers occasions . . . used lighted candles on the holy table or communion table (or on a ledge immediately over the said table, and appearing and intended to appear part thereof), during the celebration of the Holy Communion, as a matter of ceremony, and at times when such lighted candles were not wanted for the purpose of giving light, and permitted and sanctioned such use of lighted candles."

"XI. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, on Christmas-day, 1868, on the day of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, February the 2nd, 1869, and on Easter Sunday, 1869, used lighted candles standing on and about and before the communion table during the performance of other parts of the morning service than the Communion Service, as a matter of ceremony, and when they were not wanted for the purpose of giving light. That you also during the whole of Divine Service, on Easter Sunday, 1869, kept a very large lighted candle, called a paschal taper, placed and standing towards the south side of the communion table, as a matter of ceremony, and when it was not wanted for the purpose of giving light. That you also, at various times, during the performance of Divine Service (to wit, on Sunday morning, November the 1st, 1868 ; Sunday morning, March the 21st, 1869, and Whit Sunday, May the 16th, 1869), caused acolytes, or attendants, as a matter of ceremony, to bear about, move, set down, and lift up various lighted candles when the same were not needed to give light."

The Dean of Arches said—

I admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain for the future from doing or sanctioning the acts so charged in these articles.—*Ibid.* pp. 99-101.

Notices of "High" Celebrations.

Notices of Feasts not directed by the Church to be observed.

The charge was as follows :—

"That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said church or chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on Sunday morning, November the 1st, 1868, publicly during the performance of Divine Service, that is to say, at the conclusion of

the Nicene Creed, gave notice that on the morning of the next day there would be a 'high celebration of the Holy Eucharist' at eleven o'clock." . . . and that you, on the same day, after the sermon, gave, or caused to be given, notice that on the next Friday, 'being the Feast of St. Leonard,' there would be a celebration of the Holy Eucharist at eleven o'clock; and that on Sunday, the 8th of November, 1868, after the Nicene Creed, you gave notice that the Holy Eucharist would be celebrated on Wednesday, 'being the Feast of St. Martin;' and on Friday, being the 'Feast of St. Britius.' And that on Sunday morning, January the 31st, 1869, after the Nicene Creed, you gave notice that 'on Tuesday next, being the Festival of our Lady, there would be a high celebration of the Holy Eucharist at eleven o'clock in the morning.'"

The Dean of Arches said—

The Prayer Book does not warrant, in my opinion, this particular mode of announcing that the Eucharist will be celebrated. According to the rubric, after the Nicene Creed notice is then to be given of the Communion, and according to the rubric after the Church militant prayer, "When the minister giveth warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion . . . after the sermon or homily ended he shall read the exhortation following." It appears to me that the epithet "high" has no sanction from the rubric, and, though perhaps in itself not very material, cannot legally be used.

It appears from the evidence, that at different times notices were given that the feasts of St. Leonard, St. Martin, and St. Britius would be observed. The rubric, after the Nicene creed, directs that "the curate shall declare unto the people what holy-days or fasting-days are in the week following to be observed." Mr. Purchas is not charged with having violated the law by omitting to give notice of these holy-days or fasting-days, but by having given notice of holy-days, which the Church has not directed to be observed. I think the holy-days, which are directed to be observed, are those, which are to be found after the preface of the Prayer Book, under the head of "A Table of all the Feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year." The feasts of St. Leonard, St. Martin, and St. Britius are not among these; I therefore think the notices of them were improper, and I must admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain from giving such notices for the future.—(*Extract from Judgment, Arches Court. Elphinstone v. Purchas, Ibid. pp. 111, 112.*)

Notices of Mortuary Celebrations.

Interpolation of a Prayer, while reading the Communion Service, after the Collect for the Queen.

Epistle and Gospel, not in the Prayer Book, read at a Mortuary Celebration.

Ceremonies on admission of an Acolyte or Choir Boy immediately before Service.

The charges were :—

"That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said church or chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on Sunday, March the 14th, 1869, at evening service, and immediately on the conclusion of your sermon, gave notice that on the next day there would be 'a mortuary celebration for the repose of a sister at eleven o'clock;' and that on Monday morning, March the 15th, 1869, while performing Divine Service in the said church or chapel, namely, while reading the Communion Service, immediately after the collect for the Queen, and before the Epistle, you interpolated and said the following words, that is to say.—'O God! whose property is ever to have mercy and to forgive, be favourable unto the soul of this Thy servant' (thereby meaning the soul of the deceased person for whose repose the said mortuary celebration was made), 'and blot out all her iniquities, that she may be loosed from the chains of death and be found meet to pass unto the enjoyment of life and felicity, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.' After which, 1 Thess. chap. iv., verse 13 to verse 18, was read as the Epistle, and the rest of the service was proceeded with, John chap. vi., verse 37 to verse 40, being read as the Gospel."

"That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said church or chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on Whit Sunday evening, May the 16th, 1869, at the usual hour for, and immediately before, the commencement of evening prayer, and in the presence of the congregation then assembled to hear Divine Service, made, received, or admitted a new acolyte or choir boy, by causing him then to kneel on one of the steps before the holy table, and reading some words or sentences out of a book, and making the sign of a cross over him, and putting into his hands a candlestick with candle, and afterwards, in like manner, putting into his hands decanters or glass bottles of wine and of water, those actions collectively being intended as and constituting a religious rite or ceremony."

The Dean of Arches said—

I think these Articles are substantially proved; and that in these circumstances the additional rites or ceremonies must be considered as illegal, on the principle of the decision in *Martin v. Mackonochie*; and I accordingly admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain from the use or sanction of the particular rites and ceremonies so charged for the future.—*Ibid.* pp. 98, 99.

Metal Crucifix, not part of architectural decorations, on or in apparent connection with the Holy Table, and seeming to be part of its furniture, covered and uncovered ceremonially and bowed to by the Minister.

The charges were:—

"That you, the said Rev. John Purchas . . . placed or caused to be placed upon the Holy Table, or on a narrow ledge resting thereon or connected therewith, or fixed immediately above the same, so as to appear to the congregation to be in contact or connection with the Holy Table, a large metal crucifix with a figure of the Saviour thereon (the same being intended for a ceremonial or religious purpose, and not being a part of the architectural decorations of the church, but being placed on such ledge with the object and intention of being made to appear a part of the furniture of the Holy Table); and that you, on the said several occasions, allowed the same so placed to remain there during the performance of Divine Service, and during the celebration of the Holy Communion. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, also, during Lent, having covered, or caused to be covered, the said crucifix so placed on the Holy Table or narrow ledge as aforesaid, with a white veil striped with a red cross, allowed the same to remain on the said Holy Table or narrow ledge so covered during the performance of Divine Service. That you also afterwards (to wit, on Easter Sunday, March the 28th, 1869), having previously removed, or caused to be removed, such veil, kept the said crucifix during Divine Service so uncovered; the circumstance of the said crucifix being so kept covered and uncovered, being intended as and constituting on each of the said occasions a ceremonial and symbolical observance during and connected with such Divine Service."

"That you, the said Rev. John Purchas did immediately before and during the performance of Divine Service bow and do reverence to the said crucifix."

The Dean of Arches said—

I think I am bound to conclude from the evidence before me, unimpeached as it is by any other testimony, and in the absence of any explanation, that the crucifix has been introduced into or connected with the performance of the services prescribed by the Prayer Book, so as to constitute an additional rite or ceremony. And I must admonish Mr. Purchas to abstain from the practice complained of in these Articles.—*Ibid.* p. 105.

Crucifix on the top of a screen separating the chancel from the body or nave of the Church.

Extract from Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the Appeal of the Reverend Charles Joseph Ridsdale, Clerk, v. Clifton, from an order of the Judge as Official Principal of the Arches Court at Canterbury; delivered 12th May, 1877:—

There remains to be considered the charge as to the Crucifix. As to this the allegation is, that the Appellant unlawfully set up and placed upon the top of the screen separating the chancel from the body or nave of the church a crucifix and twenty-four metal candlesticks with candles which were lighted on either side of the Crucifix.

The learned Judge, whose decision is under Appeal, thus describes the Screen and Crucifix:—"There is a screen of open ironwork some 9 feet high stretching across the church at the entrance to the chancel; the middle portion of this screen rises to a peak, and is surmounted by a crucifix or figure of our Saviour on the Cross in full relief and about 18 inches long—this is the crucifix complained of. The screen of course, from its position, directly faces the congregation, and the sculptured or moulded figure of our Lord is turned towards them. There is, further, a row of candles at distances of nearly a foot apart all along the top of the screen, which is continued up the central and rising portion of it, the last candles coming close up to the crucifix on either side, so that when the candles are lighted for the evening service, I should presume that the crucifix would stand in a full light."

The learned Judge arrives at the conclusion that the crucifix so placed formed an ordinary feature in the parish churches before the Reformation, and that it did so, not as a mere architectural ornament, but as an object of reverence and adoration.

He further points out that the worship of it was enjoined in the Sarum Missal, in which the order of service for Palm Sunday ends with the adoration of the Rood by the celebrant and choir before passing into the chancel.

"It is no doubt easy to say, what proof is there of idolatry now? What facts are there to point to a probability of 'abuse'?"

"But when the Court is dealing with a well-known sacred object—an object enjoined and put up by authority in all the churches of England before the Reformation, in a particular part of the church and for the particular purpose of 'adoration'—when the Court finds that the same object, both in the church and out of it, is still worshipped by those who adhere to the unreformed Romish faith, and when it is told that, now, after a lapse of 300 years, it is suddenly proposed to set up again this same object in the same part of the church as an architectural ornament only, it is hard not to distrust the uses to which it may come to be put, or escape the apprehension that what begins in 'decoration' may end in 'idolatry.'"

"If this apprehension is a just and reasonable one, then there exists that likelihood and danger of 'superstitious reverence' which the Privy Council in *Philpotts v. Boyd* pronounced to be fatal to the lawfulness of all images and figures set up in a church.

In these observations of the learned Judge their Lordships concur; and they select them as the grounds of his decision which commend themselves to their judgment. They are prepared, under the circumstances of this case, to affirm the decision directing the removal of the crucifix, while at the same time they desire to say that they think it important to maintain, as to representations of sacred persons and objects in a church, the liberty established in *Philpotts v. Boyd*, subject to the power and duty of the Ordinary so as to exercise his judicial discretion in granting or refusing faculties, as to guard against things likely to be abused for purposes of superstition.—*Official copy of Judgment of the Privy Council in Ridsdale v. Clifton*, pp. 48, 49, 51, and 52.

Figure of the Infant Saviour with lilies over the credence table at Christmas.

Stuffed Dove over the Holy Table on Whitsun-Day.

The charges were:—

"That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, on the occasion of a celebration of the Holy Communion at Midnight on Christmas Eve, the 24th of December, 1868, placed or caused to be placed, on a shelf just above the credence-table in the said church, a modelled figure of the infant Saviour, with two lilies on either side, the same being so then placed as a part of the ceremonial of the service of that night, and which was subsequently removed; and that on Whit Sunday, May the 16th, 1869, you placed or caused to be placed, in the said church or chapel, above and

hanging over the holy table, a figure, image, or stuffed skin of a dove in a flying attitude, and kept the same so placed during Divine Service, the same being so then placed and kept as a part of the ceremonial of the service."

The Dean of Arches said—

I think the result of the evidence is that these figures, having regard to the time and the services during which they were brought in and removed, being also emblematic in their character, were ceremonially used upon the occasions referred to, and that, according to the judgment in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, they were therefore illegal.—*Ibid.* p. 107.

CROSS ON COMMUNION TABLE.

In the Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, on the Appeal of *Marsters v. Durst*, from the Court of Arches; delivered 11th July, 1876, it was stated:

This is a criminal suit promoted in the Court of Arches against the Appellant, who is one of the Churchwardens of the Parish of St. Margaret, in the Borough of King's Lynn, for having removed from the church, without a faculty, a certain moveable cross of wood which had been placed on a ledge called a "re-table" at the back of and above the Communion Table.

The Respondent is the Vicar of the parish, and the cross was placed there by his authority, but without the sanction of a faculty.

The question which their Lordships are thus called upon to decide is the single one of the legality of a cross of this description in the place which it occupied when the Appellant removed it from the church.

The Special Case states that the cross is above three feet in height; that it is a moveable one: that it was placed by the Respondent's orders on a structure of wood called a "re-table" consisting of a wooden ledge at the back of the Communion Table, having a front of wood about eight inches deep, coming down to within five-sixteenths of an inch of the surface of the Communion Table, and that this structure is fixed to the wall by nails.

A photograph is appended to the Special Case, from which, and the statements in this case, it is plain that the Communion Table and the "re-table" would at a very short distance bear the appearance of one entire table or structure.

It is further stated that the cross was placed on this ledge with "the intention that it should remain there permanently."

Their Lordships are therefore of opinion that the cross in the position which it occupied while in the church is forbidden by law; and they will advise Her Majesty that the present suit should be dismissed.—*Official copy of the Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Marsters v. Durst.*

"REAL PRESENCE," SACRIFICE AND ADORATION.

In the Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the Appeal of *Sheppard v. Bennett* from the Court of Arches, delivered 8th of June, 1872, the following remarks were made regarding the Real Presence,—Sacrifice in the Holy Communion, —and Adoration.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

Their Lordships may consider the remaining charges against the Respondent under three heads:—

I. As to the presence of Christ in the Holy Communion.

II. As to sacrifice in the Holy Communion.

III. As to adoration of Christ present in the Holy Communion.

The Respondent is charged with maintaining under these three heads the following propositions.

1. That in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is an actual presence of

the true Body and Blood of our Lord in the consecrated bread and wine, by virtue of and upon the consecration, without or external to the communicant, and irrespective of the faith and worthiness of the communicant, and separately from the act of reception by the communicant; and it was contended by Counsel under this head that the true Body of Christ meant the natural body.

Their Lordships are bound to consider, in the first place, what has been affirmed and what has been denied, in reference to the doctrine to which these three statements relate.

The 4th Article of Religion affirms:—

1. That Christ did truly rise from death and took again His body, with flesh and bones and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into Heaven; and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the Last Day.

In the 28th Article of Religion it is affirmed:—

1. "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another, but rather is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ."

2. "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

3. "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner."

4. "The mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith."

5. "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

By the 29th Article of Religion it is affirmed:—

6. "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."

By the 31st it is affirmed:—

7. "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone." And—

8. "The sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

9. In the Catechism it is stated that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Their Lordships proceed, with these passages before them, to examine the charges made against the Respondent. The first relates to the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Communion.

The Church of England in the passages just cited holds and teaches affirmatively that in the Lord's Supper the Body and Blood of Christ are given to, taken, and received by the faithful communicant. She implies, therefore, to that extent, a presence of Christ in the ordinance to the soul of the worthy recipient. As to the mode of this presence she affirms nothing, except that the Body of Christ is "given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," and that "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is faith." Any other presence than this—any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver—the Church does not by her Articles and Formularies affirm or require her ministers to accept. This cannot be stated too plainly.—*Six Privy Council Judgments*, annotated by Rev. W. G. Brooke, pp. 232-4.

SACRIFICE IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

II. The next charge against the Respondent is, that he has maintained that the Communion Table is an altar of sacrifice, at which the priest appears in a sacerdotal

position at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and that at such celebration there is a great sacrifice or offering of our Lord by the ministering priest, in which the mediation of our Lord ascends from the altar to plead for the sins of men.

The Church of England does not by her Articles or Formularies, teach or affirm the doctrine maintained by the Respondent. That she has deliberately ceased to do so would clearly appear from a comparison of the present Communion Office with that in King Edward's First Book, and of this again with the Canon of the Mass in the Sarum missal.

This subject was fully discussed before their Lordships in *Westerton v. Liddell*, when it was decided that the "change in the view taken of the sacrament naturally called for a corresponding change in the altar. It was no longer to be an altar of sacrifice, but merely a table at which the communicants were to partake of the Lord's Supper."

The 31st Article of Religion, after laying down the proposition (which is adopted also, in words nearly the same, in the Prayer of Consecration), that "the offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual," and that "there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone," proceeds, on the strength of these propositions, to say that "the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

It is not lawful for a clergyman to contradict, expressly or by inference, either the proposition which forms the first part of this Article, or any proposition plainly deducible from the condemnation of propitiatory masses which forms the second part of it, and is stated as a corollary to the first.

It is not lawful for a clergyman to teach that the sacrifice or offering of Christ upon the Cross, or the redemption, propitiation, or satisfaction, wrought by it, is or can be repeated in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper; nor that in that ordinance there is or can be any sacrifice or offering of Christ which is efficacious, in the sense in which Christ's death is efficacious, to procure the remission of the guilt or punishment of sins.—*Ibid.* pp. 238-9.

ADORATION.

III. Their Lordships now proceed to the third charge, which relates to the adoration of Christ present in the Sacrament.

The Declaration of Kneeling states that, by the direction that the communicants shall receive the consecrated elements kneeling, "no adoration is intended or ought to be done either to the Sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or to any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."

According to this declaration, neither the elements nor any corporal presence of Christ therein ought to be adored.

The 28th Article lays down that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped."

In the 25th Article it had been affirmed that "the Sacraments were not ordained by Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we shall duly use them."

It was laid down in *Martin v. Mackonochie* that such acts as the elevation of the cup and paten, and kneeling and prostration of the minister before them, were unlawful, because they were not prescribed in the Rubric of the Communion Office, and because acts not prescribed were to be taken as forbidden. Their Lordships in that judgment adopted the words of the committee in *Westerton v. Liddell*; "for the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; no omission and no addition can be permitted."

It follows then that the Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration to the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements. She has been careful to exclude any act of adoration on the part of the minister at or after the consecration of the elements and to explain the posture of kneeling prescribed by the Rubric.—*Ibid.* 242-3.

CEREMONIALLY WASHING, RINSING, AND WIPING THE COMMUNION CUP.

The Dean of Arches in delivering Judgment on the 10th June, 1879, in the case of "Dean and others, *v. Rev. S. F. Green*" (St. John's, Miles Platting), said—

"Then came the ninth charge, which was that of washing the cup as a ceremonial act, and from what the witnesses had said he had no doubt that what took place was a careful washing of the cup and drinking of the contents, not once but twice, and that there was a rinsing and a wiping of the cup in a manner which was evidently intended as a species of ceremony. It followed, therefore, that this was a case outside the ceremonies provided for by the Rubrics, and not admissible. The introduction of any fresh ceremony, provision for which was not found in the rubrics, was contrary to law, and therefore he thought that allegation was also proved. . . .

"A Monition would therefore go to the defendant admonishing him to discontinue the acts complained of and not repeat them."

EASTWARD POSITION (STANDING WITH BACK TO PEOPLE).

In the above case of "Dean and others *v. Green*" the Representation charged the defendant "when officiating in his church in the Communion Service with unlawfully standing while saying the Prayer of consecration in the said service at the middle of the west side of the Communion Table (such Communion Table then standing against the east wall with its shorter sides towards the north and south) in such wise that during the whole time of his saying the said prayer he was between the people and the Communion Table with his back to the people so as to prevent the communicants then present from seeing him break the Bread or take the Cup in his hand."

The Dean of Arches in delivering Judgment said :—

"The eighth was what was commonly known as the use of the Eastward Position ; and it was made very plain by the evidence that the defendant stood with his back to the congregation, so that those who were seated in the aisles immediately behind him, and running down the centre of the church—the seats branching off as they usually did from each side of the aisle—those seated on either side could not possibly see the manual acts during the administrations owing to the interposition of the body of the defendant. . . .

"A Monition would therefore go to the defendant admonishing him to discontinue the acts complained of and not repeat them."

A BALDACCHINO.

Dr. Tristram (the Chancellor of the Diocese of London), on December 15th, 1873, in delivering Judgment in the Consistory Court of London, in the case of the "Vicar and Churchwardens of the Parish of St. Barnabas, Pimlico *v. Bowron*," said—

"After much consideration, I have come to the conclusion that the Baldacchino, for authorizing the erection of which a faculty is prayed, is an ornament of the church within the meaning of the Rubrics ; and as it is not prescribed by the Rubrics, or can be regarded as in any way necessary or subsidiary to the performance of the services of the Church, I decline to order the faculty to issue."

BIRETTA.

In the case of "Hudson and others *v. Tooth*" (St. James's, Hatcham), the Respondent was charged with having unlawfully permitted to be worn by the officiating minister during the time of Divine Service a certain covering on the head—namely, a cap commonly called a Biretta.

The Dean of Arches in delivering Judgment in the case on the 18th July, 1876, ordered a Monition to issue to the respondent, admonishing him to refrain from the practice in future.

STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

In the case of "*Clifton v. Ridsdale*" (the Folkestone Case) one of the charges was as follows :—

"That the said Rev. Charles Joseph Ridsdale, without lawful authority had unlawfully set up and placed in his said church since the consecration thereof, that is to say, in the year 1871, and still unlawfully retains therein certain representations of figures in coloured relief, of plastic material, purporting to represent scenes of our Lord's Passion, attached to the walls of the said church, and forming what are commonly known as Stations of the Cross and Passion, such as are commonly used in Roman Catholic churches, and not in churches of the Church of England, and that some of the said representations relate to legendary and superstitious scenes, not part of the Gospel history, and not accepted or recognized as authentic by the Church of England, and that the said representations as a whole tend to encourage ideas and devotions of an unauthorized and superstitious kind and are unlawful."

The Dean of Arches in delivering Judgment on the 3rd of February, 1876, condemning the pictures of the Stations of the Cross (fourteen in number), said :—

"It is needless to enter into the history of this set of pictures. Whatever origin they or some of them had, it is clear that the three falls of Christ under the Cross, and the legend of Sainte Véronique, have no warrant in Gospel history.

"It is also clearly established by the two devotional books put in evidence, '*The Crown of Jesus*,' published under the authority of Cardinal Wiseman and four Roman Catholic archbishops of Ireland; and '*The Key of Heaven*,' by St. Alphonsus Liguori; that these fourteen representations are to the present day authorized objects of adoration in that Church.

"The entire set viewed as a whole, and in their relation to their well-known history, must be regarded, I think, as likely (if not intended) to be used for the purposes for which they always have been used, and not for the mere purpose of decorating the church. I shall, therefore, as I have above said, order their removal."

CEREMONIAL USE OF FIGURES OF ANGELS WITH GILT WINGS—

CRUCIFIX OVER NAVE—SECOND COMMUNION TABLE—

TOLLING CHURCH BELL DURING CONSECRATION PRAYER.

The Dean of Arches in delivering Judgment on 18th July, 1876, in the case of "*Hudson v. Tooth*" (St. James's, Hatcham), said :—

"The other ceremonies and observances, including tolling the great bell of the church, of which evidence has been here given, have been each and all at one time or other declared unlawful, by the decisions either of this Court or the Court of Appeal, except perhaps the ceremonial use of the figures of Angels with gilt wings, but the principle of those decisions excludes the addition of any other ceremonial observance to those prescribed by the Rubrics and appears to be now, therefore, applicable to the use of these figures.

"Under these circumstances it only remains for me to order a Monition to issue to the Respondent, admonishing him to refrain from these various practices in future, and to order that he shall pay the costs of these proceedings.

"Complaint has been made in this suit of certain structures which have been put up by the Respondent's authority in the church. A Crucifix is set up on a beam crossing the nave of the church, and a second Communion Table has been placed in the south aisle; and as no faculty has been obtained for these additions and alterations, I must order them to be removed."

USE OF WAFERS.

In the case of "*Perkins v. Rev. R. W. Enraght*" (Holy Trinity, Bordesley), the Representation charged the Defendant that he "When officiating in his said church in the Communion Service, and in the administration of the Communion to the communicants, unlawfully used in such service and administration wafers not being, and instead of, bread such as is usual to be eaten."

The Dean of Arches in giving Judgment on the 9th August, 1879, said—

The facts and offences alleged in the Representation had been very clearly proved, and he should accordingly order a Monition to issue against the Defendant (Mr. Enraght) to discontinue them in future."

INDEX TO ILLEGAL CEREMONIES, &c.

	PAGE
Adoration	29
Agnus Dei:	
Interpolation of	14
Ashes:	
Blessing and giving to the people on Ash Wednesday	22
Acolyte or Choir Boy:	
Ceremonies on admission of	24
Attending Minister reading the Gospel	20
With Candles	21
Angels, figures of, with gilt wings	31
Baldacchino	31
Banners carried in Procession	21
Bell, Tolling, during the Consecration of Elements	14, 31
Biretta	30
Candles illegal:	
Lighted when not wanted for purpose of giving light	23
Lighted and carried in procession	21
Blessing of, and giving to the people on Candlemas Day	23
Used at reading the Gospel	23
Paschal taper at Easter	23
Candles, Elevation of, at parts of Communion Service	7
Lighted at Morning Service	23
When not required for light	23
Choristers in red and white dresses	21
Choir Boys, Ceremonies on admission of	24
Communion Table, Introduction of Second	31
Communion Cup:	
Washing, rinsing, and wiping of	30
Cross:	
Sign of, by Minister at times during service	15
On Communion Table	27
Cereoniarius in Cotta, &c.	21
Crucifer:	
With Crucifix	20

Crucifix :		
Carried in procession		21
Metal, on Holy Table, covered and uncovered ceremonially, and bowed to by the Minister		25
On the top of a screen separating the Chancel from the body or nave of the Church		25
Apparently fixed and part of Communion Table		25
Over Nave		31
Dove Stuffed :		
On the Holy Table		26
Eastward Position :		
Back to people		15, 30
Elevation :		
Of Elements		4
Of Paten, or Wafer, or Cup		4
Of Chalice		5
Of Offertory Alms		5
Feasts :		
Notices of, not directed by the Church		23
Figures with gilt wings on a Communion Table		31
"High" Celebration :		
Notices of		23
Incense, illegal :		
Used for censuring persons and things during the Celebration of the Holy Communion		9
Used for censuring during Divine Service		9
Used for censuring the Crucifix		9
Infant Saviour, Figure of :		
With lilies over Credence Table		26
Kneeling, illegal :		
Before the consecrated elements		5
During Consecration prayer		5
Kissing :		
The Gospel Book		15
Minister reading Gospel :		
Attended by Acolytes		20
Mortuary Celebration :		
Notices of		24
Epistle and Gospel not in the Prayer Book read at		24
Notices :		
Of "High" Celebration		23
Of Mortuary Celebration		24
Palms :		
Lighted Candles, and Crucifix carried in procession		21
Blessing of, and giving to the people		21

	PAGE
Paschal light	23
Positions:	
Standing in front of the Holy Table with back to the people during the Prayer of Consecration	15, 30
Standing in front of—middle—the Holy Table with back to the people while reading the Collects before the Epistle	20
Standing at foot of the Holy Table with back to the people while reading the Collects after the Creed at Evening Prayer	20
Standing with back to the people while reading the Epistle	20
Standing with back to the people while reading the Gospel	20
Prayer, Interpolation of, for Mortuary Celebration	24
Processions	21
Prostration:	
Before the consecrated elements	5
During Consecration Prayer	5
Real Presence, The	27
Sacramental Wine:	
Administration of Wine mixed with water during the Service	10
Mixed with Water before Service	10
Sacrifice in the Holy Communion	28
Stations of the Cross	31
Table, Holy:	
Leaving uncovered on Good Friday	15
Te Deum:	
Thurifer with incense	21
Singing of, after Evening Service, with Crucifix and Banners	20
Vestments:	
Cope, Albs, Apparels, Tippetts, Stoles, Dalmatics, Maniples	1
Chasuble, Tunics, Tunicles, Albs	13
Wafers:	
Administering to communicants	13, 14, 31

"THE FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY, ESPECIALLY IN REFERENCE TO THE REFORMATION AND THE CHARACTERS OF THE REFORMERS, AS PERTINACIOUSLY REPEATED BY THE ADVOCATES OF RITUALISM."

BY THE REV. T. P. BOULTBEE, M.A., LL.D., PRINCIPAL OF ST. JOHN'S HALL, THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, HIGHBURY, MIDDLESEX.

"WOE unto them that call evil good, and good evil ; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness ; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter. . . Woe unto them . . . which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him."

What darkness is like the darkness of bewildering falsehood, and what light is like the truth ? Once One walked this earth who called Himself "*The Truth*." Brightly beamed the full-orbed face of that Eternal Truth on the world's darkness. But around Him surged the legions of that opposite who is called "the father of lies ;" the traitor practised his treason ; and "false witness was sought to put Him to death." Calm and silent the august face of the Truth gleamed through the falsehood. But the gathering lies prevailed. Affixed to the accursed cross, the Truth Himself expired, and all was dark. "The sun was darkened," and "there was darkness over all the earth."

And so He who was the Truth was laid in the tomb, and the power of falsehood prevailed in its final triumph. Nay ! this was the very victory of the Truth of God ! The blood did but seal the covenant. "Every promise of God was now yea and amen in Christ Jesus." "A testament is of force after men are dead," and now no power of Satan's utmost lie can break the bond. When He who is the Truth died, He broke the power of the lie which no other force could have shattered.

And so the living Truth arose ; He ascended to the realms of light, to prepare that city which lieth four square, and one of whose precious securities is this, that "without is whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." And meanwhile of His people it is said that they are "of the truth," and "walk in light ;" and that they enjoy the presence of Him who is the Spirit of Truth, and who "shall guide them into all the Truth," not, "all truth," but "all the Truth."

But did the Power of Falsehood retire baffled and ruined? Did the fair face of Truth shine forth, clear, radiant, unclouded for ever? No, not yet! It shall be so. But not yet. Darker than ever gathered the cloud of lies over the early Church. Here, settling like a mist obscuring the outlines of precious saving truths. There, like some deceptive fog refracting the rays of truth till mock suns seemed to shine in the firmament, and rainbows of false hopes pledged covenants with no word of God for their sanction.

Oh, if the prophet of old could weep over the "refuges of lies" which Israel sought. If the Baal, the Nebo, the Osiris, the Zeus, the Mars were lies dark as hell itself, what shall we say to the cloud of falsehood that gathers around us as we take our sad way down the darkened pages of the History of the Church or Christ? False miracle, spurious legend, filth and squalor for the bright purity of sanctity, tyranny for the rule of love, these and more dismay and distract by turns, till we ask, Where is Christ? Where is truth?

But I have to plough, if it may be, one straight furrow through this wide field of falsity. Let us take, then, the one master lie round which others circle, and to the growth of which they contribute. Take the Papacy. See, as you pass down the centuries, layer after layer of untruth deposited, until the column of falsehood touches the very skies, and upbears the Man of Sin, at length "a God confessed." See the last effort, the infallible man, that mockery of mockeries, that contradiction of nature, that crowning falsehood. Let us, then, trace down in rapid review those "falsifications of history" which have had such an outcome, and are the root of most of the others under which we labour.

Eight centuries had passed over the Church at the time when we first take up the dark history of fraud. During that period the bishops of Rome, partly by successful policy, partly by the force of circumstances, had won for themselves a high but a very ill-defined position in the Western Church. They received much deference, they exercised considerable sway, but the bounds of these no man well knew. There was a blank in the ecclesiastical annals of Rome which invited the work of the forger. Few but students of ecclesiastical history know how scanty are the actual records of the first three centuries. Few are aware how singularly obscure is the Roman episcopate during the first four centuries and a half. The African, the Egyptian, the Syrian, nay, the Gallican Churches gave their critics, their apologists, their divines, their historians, to the cause of Christianity. The Roman Church gave none. After Clement's brief epistle the Roman bishops were almost silent for centuries. The energy of a Cyprian, or some foreign brother, might draw from one of them a letter which remains on record, but the name of no Roman bishop, nay, scarcely of a Roman (for Jerome was a Dalmatian) appears on the roll of the early Fathers. In the middle of the eighth century appeared, no man can say precisely whence, the great, the audacious, yet "clumsy" forgery, known as the Decretals of Isidore. They contained what purported to be about 100 decrees of the earliest Popes, together with some other documents. They laid down the following propositions at which the Nicene Fathers would have stood aghast. First, the decrees of Councils require confirmation from the Pope; second, the Pope is bishop of the universal Church, and the other bishops are his servants. There was infallibility in the shell; we have lived to see it hatched. A Pope equal to the occasion sat in the Roman chair. Nicholas I. assured doubting prelates, to whom these things were new, that these documents had been long preserved in the Roman archives.

About two centuries again passed away. At the time of our Norman Conquest came the moment when Europe was ripe for the full development of the Papal system, and when Hildebrand was the man who knew that the hour was come. Then were the forgeries of Isidore drafted into a code of Papal law, fresh inventions were added, historical facts were tampered with, and now the Pope of the eleventh century stood forth armed with forgery upon forgery, claiming to be infallible, supreme, inviolable, sacred, the giver of crowns, the deposer of monarchs. Another hundred years rolls away. In the middle of the 12th century Gratian compiled his famous Decretum, which became thenceforth the code of Canon Law for Europe. To the mass of former forgeries he added his own fabrications, and now in this third stage of development the Pope was declared to stand above all laws since they derive all force from him alone. And now heresy was proclaimed a capital offence, and all who spoke against a Papal decision or doctrine, were pronounced heretics.

But we have not yet done. The Decretals implied false history. It was needful that history should not contradict them. For this purpose history must be re-written, and accordingly it was re-written. But leaving these and passing on yet another 100 years, we come to one of the most audacious fabrications of all. In the course of the Crusades, the real object of which on the part of the Pope was to subject the Eastern Church to his sway, the Papal emissaries found that their forged decretals and Roman decisions were simply regarded with amazement by the Greeks, who (whatever their faults) had at least a genuine and ancient Christian literature. A Greek would demand to know, as we should, what the Basils, and Gregories, and Cyrils, and Chrysostoms of old said on these points. A Latin theologian was not wanting to the occasion. He produced in the middle of the thirteenth century a collection of spurious passages from these venerable Greek fathers and from Greek Councils, all bearing out the Papal pretensions. The infallible Pope Urban IV. accepted the document, and sent it to the great contemporary theologian, Thomas Aquinas. He, ignorant of Greek, adopted the whole, and thenceforward, not only in the Canon Law, but in the scholastic system which the Universities taught, the Papal infallibility with its momentous consequences prevailed.

One hundred years more, and in the middle of the 15th century Constantinople fell, the Greek empire was dissolved, but Greek learning fled into Western Europe, the printing press threw open the gates of knowledge, the advancing tide of learning was surging against the Roman gates. Yet half a century more, and the Reformation, a blended movement of statesmanship, of popular feeling, of learning, and of religion, changed the face of the world.

What then, became of the colossal forgeries? They simply collapsed. The Reformers themselves were astounded to discover the rottenness of the basis of the Papal power. Yet, as Gibbon says, "by the same fortune which has attended the decretals and the Sibylline oracles, the edifice has subsisted after the foundations have been undermined." Banished from the sphere of genuine learning, the canon law of Rome still perpetuates the lie of the decretals, and the catechism of the Council of Trent, "edited by the command of our most illustrious Lord Pius the Fifth," bases its proof of the seven sacraments on the forged decretals.

Falsification on the ancient scale, since the revival of learning, and the existence of a powerful Protestant body, has been impossible. But the spirit of falsehood has neither departed nor slept.

If history cannot be manufactured, it can be incrustated with an aggregation of lies, facts can be distorted, character and motive misrepresented, until that which you read, is as worthless in point of history as a mere romance. This has been the weapon against the Reformation from the first. Jewel begins his Apology for the Church of England with bitter complaints of the falsehoods industriously circulated against the cause of the Reformation.

Writing in the early years of Elizabeth, he thus utters his complaint.

"They cry out that we are all heretics; that we have invented new, and revived old heresies from hell itself; that we are torn by dissension; that we have impiously made war with God Himself; that we live without care or worship of God; that we scorn all good deeds; that we use no discipline of virtue, no laws, no good morals; that we care not for justice, equity or right; that we give the reins to every crime, and incite the people to every kind of license and lust. . . . And these things are not talked over in corners, but men possessing considerable eloquence and not destitute of learning are engaged by the Popes to handle these topics copiously and with adornments of style. . . . Now of these things brought against us, part are manifestly false; part, though likewise false, bear some show and likeness of truth so that the incautious reader is readily caught by them; part, though they may be *called* crimes, we acknowledge and own as most righteous deeds. . . . This is the power of darkness. But we thank God that our cause is one on which no reproach can be cast which may not be hurled against the holy fathers, against the prophets, the apostles, against Christ Himself."

So spoke Jewel—so we may say, spoke the Church of England three hundred years ago. For, as we may see from Strype's account of the Apology, (Annals, c. 25) Jewel was regarded as the spokesman of the Church and State of England in this work, and in this light his work was received by the Council of Trent and the foreign divines generally.

Now I feel in a great difficulty; here is the flood, the universal deluge of misrepresentation spreading before me and beyond me, how shall I find any main current down which I may direct my adventurous bark, and avoid losing myself and my audience in a weary discursiveness?

I am tempted to follow one line of illustration opened by the answer of the Romish pervert, Harding, to the charge made by Jewel, that so many thousands of our Protestant brethren had been painfully tortured and destroyed. Thus retorts Harding, "This is the chief argument ye make in all that huge dunghill of your stinking martyrs, which ye have entitled, 'Acts and Monuments.'" For this will enable us to follow the truly diabolical succession of reviling of the martyrs of our faith down to our own times.

Harding, in those words, singles out the famous 'Acts and Monuments' of John Foxe; a work which at once invited the attacks of every Roman champion, and which, from that day to this, has been made the target of countless arrows. The first edition was published only five years after the death of Mary, whilst (so to speak) the embers of Smithfield were still warm. If ever book challenged and received enquiry, whilst men's memories were vibrating with keenest tension to the stroke of the terrible events recorded, it was this. It was received with enthusiasm in England. When a second edition was published in 1571, the Convocation of Canterbury, the same which finally confirmed the Thirty-nine Articles

passed a resolution that a copy of the Acts and Monuments should be placed in the churches, and in the halls and houses of the Bishops, Archdeacons, and others, to be read and studied by their own families or those who might resort thither. What would the Convocation of 1871 say to a similar proposition? But if ever book had Church of England authorization it was this, at least as we are accustomed now-a-days to hear Church authorization defined. But now for the succession of those who have assailed this great work—unique in our language.

We can only select a few of the chief.

In Foxe's days it was immediately assailed by Harpsfield, one of the most learned and consistent papists of Henry's and Mary's reigns. He published a reply to the first edition of Foxe 1566. The well known Jesuit Parsons, who was a Protestant pervert, and one of the most active conspirators against Elizabeth about the time of the Spanish Armada, published a reply to Foxe in five volumes in 1603. Now if it had been possible to overthrow the credit of Foxe as a careful and accurate historian, these men possessed the ability, the means of information, and the will to do it. That they call him a liar again and again is notorious, but I need only refer to the careful analysis of their works made by the late Prebendary Townsend to show that they have scarcely in the slightest degree shaken any of his facts. After these, Heylyn and Jeremy Collier in the 17th century criticized Foxe somewhat severely, from the point of view of an English High Churchman, but they attack his opinions and his taste, but do not shake his credit as a historian. The present century has seen a more formidable onslaught made on the venerable writer. It will suffice to name the late learned but eccentric S. R. Maitland among names of acknowledged credit, as that of one who wrote with great vehemence, and brought great critical acumen to bear, against Foxe's work. The result of Townsend's careful analysis of Maitland's assault, is this. "He had discovered innumerable misprints, blunders, and various readings. He has detected the results of imperfect transcriptions. He has proved that the character of John Foxe was weak, though pious; and that many of his conclusions and opinions were of questionable value; but he has not overthrown one material fact recorded. . . . He has left untouched the great mass of facts which constituted the chief value of Foxe's labours. . . . He has utterly failed, therefore, in his attempts to prove that our fathers were fools for their admiration of Foxe, or that his pages are unworthy of the attention of their sons."

We take it, therefore, as proved by the confession of failure, that good old Foxe is a true historian, and that we may *primâ facie*, accept as a fact the record which we find in his pages. I presume we should not expect every date, every conversation, all the minutiae of a work so marvellous for its details, to be in all cases accurate. I presume we shall not expect to find that editors have given us a very perfect text. I presume that no one will consider us bound to accept all the good old man's opinions, whether about doctrine, or Church, or State. I presume that we shall not be pledged to admire or approve all the amenities of style in which the writer, of the 16th century indulged. But the truthfulness of John Foxe, and his credit as a historian, subject to the allowances we make in reading all histories, and especially contemporary history, written before different accounts can be fully compared stand completely vindicated.

Now a step further. In the regions of credible and creditable controversy the

question stands as we have stated it. But there is another class of writers who have revived in our own century the accusations, and have worded them in the offensive language, used by the opponents of our Reformers in Elizabeth's days. Some of these are Romanists. One (I do not know what to call him, but he sold relics of Tom Paine) was William Cobbett. Some are professed members of our own Church. I do not know why I should name the former unless because the latter seem to have drawn their inspiration from them.

One Eusebius Andrews, a Roman Catholic bookseller, between 40 and 50 years ago, published a series of letters intended as a popular antidote to Foxe, in which Foxe is held up to execration as a liar. As this word *liar* is so freely used, let us take this opportunity of illustrating its use. Quoting from Parsons, Andrews refers to "A note of more than 120 lies uttered by John Foxe, in less than three leaves of his Acts and Monuments." A terrible catalogue indeed! We turn with curiosity to discover what these are. The lies do not relate to facts but doctrines—and they are thus enumerated: "Four lies about justification; one about the conditions of salvation, which might be made ten; one about distrust of salvation; five about Rome and charity; two about God's law; a heap of lies about good works;"—and so on until he makes up more than six score lies, which, says he, "is more than I promised."

If all controversialists who differ in opinion about doctrine may brand their opponents thus, it will fare with us worse than with David, who only said in his haste that "all men are liars."

To Eusebius Andrews we must add the infamous work by William Cobbett, entitled a History of the Reformation. The book is so vile and shameful in its language, and so mad in its disregard of the plain facts of history as to be beneath criticism. It is only worth notice because it is largely circulated among the lower orders at the low price of sixpence by Romanist publishers, and is calculated to sow sedition and irreligion broadcast among the multitude. It has been answered (as the members of this Association are aware) very fully and ably by Mr. Collette. But who can follow out the lie whithersoever it goeth? Who can undo the mischief it has wrought? And how shall we induce the ignorant mind that has taken in the broad sarcasm and the ribald jest, to read or understand the true history?

But not for Eusebius Andrews or William Cobbett have we noted their names here. Amongst those who still profess adherence to our Church are those who have taken up their parable, and seem, as far as we may judge from their works, to have used the same materials.

Prominent among these Dr. Littledale. His name has been long before the public in connection with those unhappy opinions about the Reformation which are working such mischief. Nor is there any writer who has at least the merit of setting forth so boldly and distinctly his opinions without hesitation or innuendo. Nor can it be doubted that in this he is the spokesman and representative of a very active and prominent, if not very numerous party. I have declined to quote the epithets which Cobbett launches against the Reformers, but I am compelled to cite the words of Dr. Littledale, which, as far as I am aware, none of his party have repudiated.

1. "Such a set of miscreants as the leading English and Scottish Reformers."

2. Having spoken of Robespierre and his fellows of the French Revolution, he says, "they merit quite as much admiration and respect as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and the others who happened to have the ill-luck to be worsted in a struggle wherein they meant to serve their adversaries as they were served themselves."

3. "Two mendacious partizans, the infamous Foxe, and the not much more respectable Burnet, have so overlaid all the history of the Reformation with falsehood, that it has been well nigh impossible for ordinary readers to get at the facts."

4. "Every fresh find (of documents) establishes more clearly the utter scoundrelism of the Reformers."

5. "We should have been burnt for refusing a new and immoral creed if that young tiger-cub Edward VI. had lived, and Cranmer had not been arrested in his wicked career by Divine vengeance."

6. "Ridley was perhaps the least disreputable of the Reformers in England."

7. "That magazine of lying bigotry Foxe's Acts and Monuments, a book which no educated man now living, possessed of any self-respect or honesty, does otherwise than repudiate with contempt and aversion."

I need not proceed any further with these extracts. This is merely calling names which any unmannerly schoolboy can do. In the Appendix there are notes containing several pages of what professes to be history, bearing out all this evil-speaking. With regard to a track of history so well worn, and trodden by the scholars of three centuries, the only question worth asking is this: Are any new facts disclosed, any of those new documents which were to establish "the scoundrelism of the Reformers"? We pass them in review, and exclaim, Why this is the old ragged regiment that has been so often marched through Coventry. Some of them have had a new feather stuck in their caps, and there have been a few attempts to sew the tatters together, and the drill is a little changed. But we know every knave of the company, for they have been paraded by every assailant these 300 years, from Harding's and Parsons' days down to William Cobbett's. As for Cranmer, we hear that he married when he was a fellow of a college—a grievous atrocity! Then his wife died, and he married again, and that was as bad as polygamy in a priest. Then there is the archiepiscopal oath of allegiance to the Pope. All about the divorce of Katherine and about poor Anne Boleyn, and indeed all the matrimonial affairs of Henry, a large part of it Cranmer's fault. Then we have the death of Cromwell, and the Act of Six Articles, which really we know Cranmer resisted to the last point of possibility. Then there is the share which he had in common with every man of his age, and several generations after, in persecuting acts. With regard to which one word is necessary. It took many a year to unlearn that fatal lesson of persecution which Protestants had learned from Rome. Thank God we have unlearned it. But if nothing else has done it, the decree of infallibility has woven persecution into the very texture of Romanism. The Syllabus of the present Pope notes it as the fatal error of the present age, that the civil power refuses to enforce the law of the Church. It is not, therefore, mere recrimination, or the question of Mary's burnings against Elizabeth's hangings. It is the living law of the persecuting Church which we execrate. But to proceed, there is the

grievous fall. Cranmer's Recantations after he had been kept face to face with death for two years. We all have been familiar with the sad story from our childhood, and no man of feeling can think or speak of it without great searchings of heart. But for one who uses Cranmer's Prayer-book, and is pledged to Cranmer's Articles, to flout those agonies of mind and body as he sits in his easy chair of the nineteenth century, requires epithets which I will not use.

Then Latimer—"he was a coward—he recanted four times;" (a gross misrepresentation) "he was coarse and profane in his style of preaching."

Ridley "introduced neologian changes into the Prayer Book, and he cast down the altars, and substituted tables."

Hooper "was a pluralist." Aye, a pluralist in wearing labours. And all of them are credited with the avarice of the courtiers, from which they struggled in vain to protect the Church.

It is the old story, just as Jewel said—"Part manifestly false—part, though false, yet with some show of truth—part, though called crimes, yet in truth righteous deeds"—part, we must add, the failures of holy men, either imperfectly enlightened, or succumbing to difficulties greater than we can estimate.

If this be so, no serious answer is needed to the old array of dislocated facts or misstated history. We know what the general verdict of history is on those terrible times. The precise adjustment of praise and blame to the principal actors in the great convulsion of the Reformation may vary; but the general verdict stands beyond all question, and is not shaken by these passing detractions. We are proud of the Reformation as Englishmen; we are thankful for it as Christians. I tremble to think that mere human beings, should be called to the task of guiding into harbour the vessel of the Church on the crest of so terrible a wave of revolution. I marvel to think that it was ever done. If those hardy navigators on those stormy seas sometimes erred, if their courage in a few instances blenched, could it well have been otherwise? Peter thrice denied his Master; shall human faith and courage be strained to the uttermost through long years of anxiety, and never falter?

But after all, let us remember ours is not a question of men but of principles. Were every infamy heaped on those devoted heads verified—Were their holy memories defiled into the dust with the ashes that consumed their mortal frames, the great principles for which they died would still remain imperishable. The Word of God to guide us and to free us, not the word of man to constrain us and enthrall us. The Sacrament of Christ to bring us into spiritual communion with Him, and not the host of the priestly consecration to bow down to and to worship. These and their kindred truths remain as our heritage. And if by God's blessing on our martyrs' labours we have received the inheritance of a Church of Apostolic order, and of pure doctrine according to God's word, we are not the dolts to forget it, nor the cravens to fail to defend it.

APPENDIX.

AUTHORITIES QUOTED.

"It was difficult to compress any account of some of the more conspicuous falsifications of history within the limits allowed for the foregoing paper. It is still more difficult to produce within a small compass historical statements sufficient to support the assertions in question. Nevertheless, the subjoined quotations it is thought, scanty as they needs must be, may suffice to carry conviction to the intelligent reader, however little versed he may be in the history of the middle ages. We have omitted previous forgeries, and have said nothing of the pretended donation of Constantine, and have commenced (p. 2) with the Decretals of the pretended Isidore. On this subject it may suffice to produce the following quotations from two writers of unquestionable authority.—*Neander*, Vol. VI. p. 102 (*Clark's Edition*).

Writing of the Pseudo Isidorian Decretals, *Neander* thus speaks:—

"This fraud was so clumsily contrived, and ignorantly executed, that had the age been a little more fitted for, or less disinclined to, critical investigations, and had the deception itself not fallen in with a predominant interest of the Church, it might have been easily detected and exposed. . . . The letters were for the most part made up of passages borrowed from far later ecclesiastical documents, which he took the liberty to alter and mutilate so as to suit his purpose and correspond with his notions, not even giving himself the trouble of removing from them things incongruous to the age in which the letters were said to have been written, and not seldom patching them together without any intelligible connection whatsoever.

These ancient Roman bishops quote Scripture from a Latin translation formed from a mixture of one made by Jerome with another that had been current in earlier times. They refer to relations between the Church and State, which could not possibly have existed in the age when these letters purport to have been written. We meet in them the most extraordinary anachronisms; as, for example, that Victor, bishop of Rome, wrote concerning the contested celebration of Easter to Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, who lived two centuries later. The Scriptural passages cited as proofs are altered and mutilated with an effrontery and ignorance equally shameful."

The general result of this may be easily placed before the least critical English reader. It is just as if a letter, supposed to have been written by an English bishop

in the time of Richard II. or Henry IV., should refer to the ecclesiastical legislation of Elizabeth, or quote Scripture in a version compounded of Cranmer's Bible and the present authorized version. It would not take much critical sagacity to discover the fraud. We need not wonder therefore that Baronius the great Roman Ecclesiastical historian, and Bellarmine the famous Jesuit controversialist, abandoned the defence of these Decretals.

If anything more need be added to this, it may be the following extract from the History of Latin Christianity by the late Dean Milman (B. v. Chap. 4):—

“On a sudden was promulgated, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently overawing at once all doubt, a new Code, which to the former authentic documents added 59 letters and decrees of the 20 oldest popes, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part among the decrees of the Popes and of the Councils from Silvester to Gregory II., 39 false decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic councils. In this vast manual of Sacerdotal Christianity the Popes appear from the first, the parents, guardians, legislators of the faith throughout the world. . . . But for the too manifest design, the aggrandizement of the See of Rome, and the aggrandizement of the whole Clergy in subordination to the See of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable;—the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history. They are now given up by all; not a voice is raised in their favour; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their own day and throughout the later history of Christianity.”

We have next to prove the reception of these false decretals by Pope Nicholas I. We produce a portion of a letter from that Pope to the Bishops of Gaul. It is given by Gieseler, Eccles. History, Vol. II. p. 333:—

“Although he had not appealed to the Apostolic See, yet ye ought not to have transgressed so many and so important decretals, and depose a bishop without consulting us. Far be it that we should not receive with due respect and with the highest distinction the settled decretals, works which the Holy Roman church hath from old times preserved, and committed to us for our custody, and which duly deposited in her archives and ancient memorials she venerates.”

The Pope proceeds to notice that some of the Gallican bishops had questioned the authority of some of the Decretals as not being found in the collection of the Canons. He then declares that “the Decretal epistles of the Roman Pontiffs are to be received, even though they are not contained in the book of the Canons.” In other words, he required the adoption of the new Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

Our next point will be the further forgeries in the time of Hildebrand (Gregory VII.). For this we may most conveniently refer to “the Pope and the

Council" by Janus, a work full of that peculiar knowledge which scarcely any one but a Roman Catholic divine can possess, and marked by that accuracy of detail which can be found only in a German scholar—a work which has been railed at abundantly but never answered. "Anselm, of Lucca, compiled the most important work at his (Hildebrand's) command between 1080 and 1086. Anselm may be called the founder of the new Gregorian system of Church law, first by extracting and putting into convenient working shape everything in the Isidorian forgeries serviceable for the Papal absolutism; next, by altering the law of the Church, through a tissue of fresh inventions and interpolations, in accordance with the requirements of his party and the standpoint of Gregory. . . . In a word, a new history and a new civil and canon law was required, and both had to be obtained by improving on the Isidorian principles with new forgeries."

Instances of historical perversions in carrying out these falsifications follow, but are too lengthy for quotation here. The uncritical reader may easily understand that when documents are garbled by words being omitted or inserted—when facts of history are misstated—when Canons are altered and modified—it is not a very difficult process to compare the later form with the earlier and thus to detect the forgery. This is how the case stands with the Hildebrandine or Gregorian alterations.

The next point is the *Decretum* of Gratian in the twelfth century. Of this there is a compendious description in Janus, p. 142. "In this work the Isidorian forgeries were combined with those of the Gregorian writers, Deusdedit, Anselm, Gregory of Pavia, and with Gratian's own additions. His work displaced all the older collections of canon law, and became the manual and repertory, not for Canonists only, but for the scholastic theologians, who for the most part derived their knowledge of Fathers and Councils from it. No book has ever come near it in its influence in the Church, although there is scarcely another so chokefull of gross errors, both intentional and unintentional."

Instances of gross alterations of early documents by Gratian are added, but are again too long for quotation.

The next point in the foregoing paper relates to history fabricated to tally with Gratian and the *Decretals*. This was done by several writers, of whom we need only name Martin of Troppau, towards the end of the 13th century; of his work, it is said by Janus (p. 279), "This book is, of all historical works of the middle ages, at once the most popular and the most utterly fabulous. Many of its fictions simply evidence the want of any historical sense . . . but many also were invented with deliberate intention."

Again, we add, instances are too long for quotation in such a note as this. But it will be manifest to an ordinary intelligence that the comparison of the distorted or invented version of a fact with the statements of the older histories is not a difficult process, and the result leaves no doubt upon the mind on the question, forgery or no forgery. Indeed the verdict of the jury of scholars of all opinions has long since been unhesitatingly given.

Our last point is the forgeries from Greek Fathers which were placed in the hands of Thomas Aquinas and accepted by Pope Urban IV. We again quote Janus, p. 265: "A Latin theologian, probably a Dominican, who had resided among the Greeks, composed a catena of spurious passages of Greek Councils and Fathers, St. Chrysostom, the two Cyrils, and a pretended Maximus, containing a dogmatic basis for these novel Papal claims. In 1261 it was laid before Urban IV. . . . Urban, evidently deceived himself, sent the document to St. Thomas Aquinas, who inserted the whole of what concerned the Primacy into his work against the Greeks, without the least suspicion of its not being genuine . . . St. Thomas, who knew no Greek, and, being educated in the Gregorian system, derived all his knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquity from Gratian, found himself at once in possession of this treasure of most weighty testimonies from the early centuries, which left no doubt in his mind that the great Councils and most influential bishops and theologians of the fourth and fifth centuries had recognized in the Pope an infallible monarch who ruled the whole Church with absolute power . . . The spurious Cyril of Alexandria is his favourite author on this subject, and he constantly quotes him."

Specimens of these forgeries may be seen in a note, p. 129, Gieseler's History.

And again we say to the unlearned reader:—Thomas Aquinas was, before the Reformation, the great master of Theology, of whom Pope John XXII. said in a bull, that "he had not written without a special inspiration of the whole Holy Ghost." These spurious passages stand to this day in the works of Thomas Aquinas, as his proof passages, and they are not to be found in any extant copies of Cyril, nor anywhere except in these falsified documents of the 13th century. This is intelligible to any understanding.

Lastly, that the spurious Decretals are referred to as authorities in the Catechism of the Council of Trent may be seen by any one who chooses to look at it. But we may produce one instance. Speaking of Confirmation, the Catechism says that by Christ "were also ordained, as St. Fabian, pontiff of Rome, testifieth, the rite of Chrism, and the words which the Catholic Church uses in its administration." Fabian was bishop of Rome in the middle of the third century. The above reference is to one of the forged decretals, attributed falsely to him."

EPISCOPAL CONDEMNATIONS OF RITUALISM.

EPISCOPAL ADDRESS OF THE YEAR 1851.

The following address, condemnatory of Ritualism, was issued by two Archbishops and 22 Bishops, in the year 1851.

We the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, do most earnestly and affectionately commend the following Address to the serious consideration of the Clergy of our respective Dioceses :—

J. B. (*Sumner*) CANTUAR.
T. (*Musgrave*) EBOR.
C. J. (*Blomfield*) LONDON.
E. (*Maltby*) DUNELM.
C. R. (*Sumner*) WINTON.
J. (*Kaye*) LINCOLN.
C. (*Bethell*) BANGOR.
H. (*Percy*) CARLISLE.
G. (*Murray*) ROCHESTER.
J. H. (*Monk*) GLOUCESTER and
BRISTOL.
C. T. (*Longley*) RIPON.
E. (*Denison*) SARUM.

G. (*Davys*) PETERBOROUGH.
C. (*Thirlwall*) ST. DAVID'S.
H. (*Pepys*) WORCESTER.
A. T. (*Gilbert*) CICESTER.
J. (*Lonsdale*) LICHFIELD.
T. (*Turton*) ELY.
S. (*Wilberforce*) OXON.
T. V. (*Short*) ST. ASAPH.
J. (*Graham*) CHESTER.
S. (*Hinds*) NORWICH.
A. (*Ollivant*) LLANDAFF.
Auckland (*Lord*) SODOR and MAN.

Beloved Brethren,—We have viewed with the deepest anxiety the troubles, suspicions, and discontents which have of late, in some parishes, accompanied the introduction of ritual observances exceeding those in common use amongst us.

We long indulged the hope that, under the influence of charity, forbearance, and a calm estimate of the small importance of such external forms, compared with the blessing of united action in the great spiritual work which is before our Church, these heats and jealousies might by mutual concessions be allayed. But since the evil still exists, and in one most important feature has assumed a new and more dangerous character, we feel that it is our duty to try whether an earnest and united address on our part, may tend, under the blessing of God, to promote the restoration of peace and harmony in the Church.

The principal point in dispute is this—whether, where the letter of the Rubric seems to warrant a measure of ritual observance, which yet, by long and possibly by unbroken practice, has not been carried out, the Clergy are either in conscience required, or absolutely at liberty, to act each upon his own view of the letter of the precept rather than by the rule of common practice. Now, as to this question, we would urge upon you the following considerations :—First, that any change of usages with which the religious feelings of a congregation have become associated is, in itself, so likely to do harm that it is not to be introduced without the greatest caution ; secondly, that beyond this, any change which makes it difficult for the congregation at large to join in the service is still more to be avoided ; thirdly, that

any change which suggests the fear of still further alterations is most injurious, and, fourthly, that, according to the rule laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, where anything is doubted or diversely taken "concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in that book, the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall always resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who, by his discretion, shall take order for quieting and appeasing of the same, so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in that book."

The fair application of these principles would, we believe, solve most of the difficulties which have arisen. It would prevent all sudden and startling alterations, and it would facilitate the reception of any change which was really lawful and desirable. We would, therefore, first urge upon our Reverend Brethren, with affectionate earnestness, the adoption of such a rule of conduct. We would beseech all who, whether by excess or defect, have broken in upon the uniformity and contributed to relax the authority of our ritual observances, to consider the importance of unity and order, and by common consent to avoid whatever might tend to violate them. In recommending this course as the best under present circumstances, we do not shut our eyes to the evil of even the appearance of any discrepancy existing between the written law and the practice of the Church. But there are many cases where the law may be variously interpreted; and we believe that we are best carrying out her own principles in urging you to have recourse in all such cases to the advice of her chief pastors.

But beyond mere attempts to restore an unusual strictness of ritual observance, we have to deal with a distinct and serious evil. A principle has of late been avowed and acted on, which, if admitted, would justify far greater and more uncertain changes. It is this—that as the Church of England is the ancient Catholic Church settled in this land before the Reformation, and was then reformed only by the casting away of certain strictly defined corruptions; therefore, whatever form or usage existed in the Church before its reformation may now be freely introduced and observed unless there can be alleged against it the distinct letter of some formal prohibition.

Now, against any such inference from the undoubted identity of the Church before and after the Reformation we feel bound to enter our clear and unhesitating protest. We believe that at the Reformation the English Church not only rejected certain corruptions, but also without in any degree severing her connexion with the ancient Catholic Church, intended to establish one uniform ritual, according to which her public services should be conducted. But it is manifest that a licence such as is contended for is wholly incompatible with any uniformity of worship whatsoever, and at variance with the universal practice of the Catholic Church, which has never given to the officiating ministers of separate congregations any such large discretion in the selection of ritual observances.

We, therefore, beseech any who may have proposed to themselves the restoration of what, under sanction of this principle, they deemed a lawful system, to consider the dangers which it involves; to see it in its true light, and to take a more just and sober view of the real position of our Church; whilst with equal earnestness we beseech others, who, either by intentional omission or neglect and laxity, may have disturbed the uniformity and weakened the authority of our prescribed ritual, to strengthen the side of order by avoiding all unnecessary deviations from the Church's rule.

Such harmony of action we are persuaded would, under God's blessing, go far towards restoring the peace of the Church. This happy result would more clearly exhibit her spiritual character. The mutual relations of her various members would be more distinctly perceived, and our Lay brethren would more readily acknowledge the special trust committed to us as stewards of the mysteries of God "for the edifying of the body of Christ." They would join with us in asserting, and, if need be, defending for themselves, as much as for us, the true spiritual freedom of the Church. They would unite with us in a more trustful spirit, and therefore with a more ready will, in enlarging her means and strengthening her powers for the great work she has to do amongst the swarming multitudes of great towns at home and of our vast dominions abroad; and that Church, which has so long received from the hands of God such unqualified blessing, might continue to be, yea, and become more and more, "a praise in the earth."

The late Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Longley) in reply to an Address presented to him by the English Church Union, on the 3rd February, 1866, at Lambeth Palace, said:—

“I cannot but feel that those who have violated a compromise and settlement which has existed for 300 years, and are introducing vestments and ceremonies of very doubtful legality, are really, though I am sure quite unconsciously, doing the work of the worst enemies of the Church I confess I have witnessed, with feelings of deep sorrow, the tone of defiance with which the recently introduced practices have in some instances been supported.”

English Church Union Monthly Circular, 1866, pp. 73, 74.

The same Archbishop, in answer to an Address from the Members of the National Club, 19th February, 1867, said:—

“I am by no means insensible to the dangers which at this moment beset the Church of England from the revival of certain ceremonial observances and the introduction of changes in our Ritual, symbolical of Doctrines at variance with those of our Reformed Church. The answer which I gave to the Address of the English Church Union twelve months ago sufficiently indicates my feeling on this subject, and subsequent events have only tended to confirm the justice of the remarks I then made.

“With an anxious desire to follow after that charity which thinketh no evil, I now find it impossible to evade the conviction that among those who are joining in the present movement for the restoration of Eucharistic vestments, the use of incense and candles in the day time, the offering of the Holy Sacrament as a propitiatory sacrifice, and the elevation of the consecrated elements for the worship of the people, there are many who are resolved, if possible, to obliterate in the formularies and worship of our Church every trace of the Reformation. The publications which are the acknowledged exponents of these opinions, leave no doubt in my mind upon this point, and having had some experience in time past of the tendency of such a movement as this, I have the less difficulty in interpreting its real bearing. Sixteen years ago I had to contend with an attempt of somewhat the same character, at St. Saviour’s, Leeds, where among other innovations the practice of confession after the Roman usage was introduced, and as soon as I proceeded to reprove it by the exercise of discipline, some of the Clergy of that Church shewed themselves in their true colours by seceding to the Church of Rome.”

In the posthumous Charge of Archbishop Longley, these words occur:—

“Now, it is far from my intention to impute to all those who have taken this ill-advised step of adopting the sacrificial vestments any sympathy with Roman error; but I am constrained to avow that there are plain indications in some of the publications which have been issued as manifestoes of the opinions of that section of our Church, that some of its professed members—yea, even of her ministers, think themselves at liberty to hold the doctrines of the Church of Rome in relation to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and yet retain their position within the pale of the Anglican Church with the avowed purpose of eliminating from its formularies every trace of the Reformation, as regards its protest against Romish error. The language they hold with respect to it is entirely incompatible with loyalty to the Church to which they profess to belong. They call it ‘a Communion deeply tainted with Protestant heresy;’ ‘Our duty,’ they say, ‘is the expulsion of the evil, not flight from it.’ It is no want of charity, therefore, to declare that they remain with us in order that they may substitute the Mass for the Communion; the obvious aim of our Reformers having been to substitute the Communion for the Mass.”

Extract from Remarks made by the present Primate (Dr. Tait) to the Archdeacons and Rural Deans, who assembled in his Library at Addington, October 4th, 1871 :—

"No one can take up a newspaper or travel in a railway carriage without being confronted with the fact that the laity of England are alarmed by seeing that there are some of the clergy who are bent on restoring the Mass and the distinctively Roman doctrines which this country rejected at the Reformation. . . . It could not be denied that there were some churches in the country where the Romish Mass, which our Reformers died to resist, was sought to be restored, and he must ask,—Can the Bishop's authority stand still while the affections of the people are being alienated by practices intended to undo all the benefits which the Reformation had conferred upon this country? We hear, it is true, a plea for liberty in the Church; and such a plea must not be treated lightly. Liberty we must not lose, but it must be liberty within the limits of the law. If the Bishop is called upon by a proper authority, it is evident that he must act, and it may be that he may find it necessary to act of his own accord. In judging of what is lawful in the Church, he must remember that he is a Bishop of the Church of England and not of that of Rome."—*Times*, Oct. 10, 1871.

The Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson) in his reply to a Lay Deputation in 1866, used the following words :—

"The use of strange vestments and ceremonies, which neither we nor our fathers have seen, has often been spoken of as childishness and frivolity. I have never been able to regard it from its ridiculous side. I believe it has gone along with a deliberate intention to alter the doctrinal position of the Church of England, by introducing into our services, ornaments, vessels, and gestures, which are not prescribed in our order of Common Prayer, and which not being prescribed, are, in effect, excluded from it."

The late Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Waldegrave) in a Pastoral Letter to the Clergy of his Diocese, in 1866, wrote :—

"There can be no longer any doubt that there exists at this moment within the pale of the Church of England an organized combination, the object of which is the re-instatement amongst us of those distinctive observances and doctrines of the Church of Rome, which were cast forth at the time of the blessed Reformation.

"The Sacrifice of the Mass, with all its attendant vestments, lights, censings, and prostrations;—Auricular Confession, with all its consequent sacerdotal influences, loosening family ties of God's institution, and working through fraternities and sisterhoods of man's invention,—these and other essentially Popish teachings and practices are now inculcated and defended by men who have subscribed to the formularies, and who retain their position as ministers of the Protestant Establishment of our land. With these formularies themselves an actual dissatisfaction is no longer denied; while the endeavour is made to supplement what is held to be defective, if not to neutralize what is considered to be erroneous, by the introduction of hymns of ominous doctrinal import, in unaccustomed, but highly significant places in the celebration of Divine worship. Nay, more than this, services are held, over and above the usual Daily Prayer and Communion Office, for which there is no legal warranty whatsoever, and in which the Romeward tendencies of the devotee meet with more satisfaction than he could otherwise attain within our borders. Nor are there wanting plain indications that even Mariolatry itself is regarded as that to which a close approximation may very desirably be made. Of the issue of all this there can be little question. . . . If things go on as they do at present, who shall say that a fearful reaction, similar to that of the latter half of the 17th century, shall not, even before these things come to pass, shake to their foundations both the Church and the Throne of these Realms?" (pp. 1 to 3.)

The Bishop of Llandaff (Dr. Ollivant), in acknowledging a declaration against Ritualism, signed by upwards of sixteen hundred laymen of Monmouthshire, in June, 1868, said :—

“That in his opinion the Sacramental theory which it is the avowed object of the Ritualistic movement to uphold, is neither the doctrine of the Church of England nor of the Catholic Church of the very earliest age. With regard to ‘practices,’ the Bishop said that, although he deemed many of them to be in themselves matters of entire indifference, and though he thought a narrow-minded exclusiveness or a disregard of decency and order in the conduct of Divine worship was as much to be deprecated on the one hand as superfluous ceremonialism on the other, he believed a great responsibility rested upon the clergy if, by the indulgence of their own self-will, they give needless offence.”—*St. James's Chronicle*, 8 June, 1868.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord Arthur Charles Hervey), in his Charge, delivered in 1871, says :—

“It appears to me that a great effort is being made at the present time to set the plain teaching of the Church of England concerning the Lord's Supper aside as insufficient, and to substitute for it a doctrine identical with that of the Church of Rome, identical in all but the metaphysical explanation by which it is justified. A physical change in the elements by which they become the natural Body and Blood of Christ locally present on the Altar, in the Hand and in the Mouth, and so proper objects of adoration ; a real sacrifice or offering up of Christ as a Propitiation ; the true Priestly character and powers of the celebrant ; the proper altar, and all the adjuncts of true sacrificial worship, seem to me to be taught in our new school. In other words, on that central doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass which Cranmer declared to be the root of all Romish error, a great effort is being made to supersede the doctrine of the Reformed Anglican Church, and to restore that of the Church of Rome. . . . When I add that there are societies of English Churchmen whose professed object it is to bring about a reunion with Rome, and to unprotestantize the Anglican Church, that it is understood that a considerable section are on the very eve of a schismatical separation from the Church of England, in order to be free from all interference with their religious tastes and tendencies, and that the Church of Rome has stronger hope of the return of England to her allegiance to the Pope now, than she has had at any time since the Reformation, and makes the conversion of England the subject of her unceasing prayers, I think I have said enough to show that there is a considerable change in the attitude of the Church of England towards Rome, and no inconsiderable danger arising to her from that quarter.” (pp. 11 to 13).

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott), in his Annual Pastoral Letter (1871), wrote :—

“Now, without saying any needlessly unkind word, I must express the opinion that it is the duty of us all cheerfully and *ex animo* to obey the law when authoritatively expounded. If, unfortunately, in any way conscience points to another course, then it is the plain duty of all who feel themselves thus directed, to resign the position they hold by law. All honest men will sympathise with them in such a course, and will offer no obstruction whatever to their doing their Master's work in such other way as the change of circumstances may necessitate. To remain among us in the hope of effecting changes of basis for our Reformed Church, or of furthering a disestablishment, which is now less likely to take place than it was two years ago, and, as far as we can judge, is remote—thus to remain, and remaining to have to stoop to subterfuges and evasions, is morally worse for themselves, and worse for the Church at large, than honest and sorrowful separation.

"At any rate, this is perfectly certain, that there is a feeling in the country everywhere beginning to show itself that will necessitate early decision, whether cheerfully to obey, or conscientiously to relinquish posts that can no longer properly be held."

The Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson), in his Charge, delivered in Nov. 1871, used these words :—

"But when we find the 'Catholic revival,' so called, asserted as the antithesis and antidote to the Reformation, which is deplored as a misfortune if not sin; when its work is admitted, and indeed avowed to be to undo what was then done; when Holy Scripture is disparaged as the rule of Faith unless as supplemented and explained by "Catholic teaching," and the Thirty-nine Articles are complained of as an unfair burden, put aside as obsolete, or interpreted in a sense which, if their words can be wrested into bearing, is undoubtedly not that which they were intended to bear; when the doctrines of those who drew them up are disclaimed as uncatholic and condemned as heretical; when language is used, popularly and without qualification, on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, which, whether capable or not of being absolved, under qualification, of contradiction to our formularies, is not only declared by Protestants but claimed by Romanists to be identical with Transubstantiation; when seven Sacraments are again taught, and Confession with absolution is enjoined, not as an occasional remedy for exceptional doubts and sorrows, but as the ordinary rule of a holy life, and the needful preparation for Holy Communion; when Prayers for the dead are recommended and Purgatory more than hinted at; when the *cultus* of the Virgin and the invocation of Saints are introduced into books of devotion, which are framed on the Romish model, and adapted to and distributed among persons of all ages, ranks, and occupations; when, finally, we are told, that in order to stabilitate the conquests over Protestantism and to re-Catholicise the Church of England, it still remains 'to make confession the ordinary custom of the masses, and to teach them to use Eucharistic worship, to establish the claim to Catholic Ritual in the highest form, to restore the Religious Life' (meaning the life of the Cloister), 'to say Mass daily, and to practise reservation for the sick;' when this movement is thus developed in its results or explained by its supporters, it is not possible that it could be received by Bishops of the Reformed Church of England with anything but disapprobation, warning, and sorrowful rebuke, unless they were unfaithful indeed to their office, their vows, and their Master the Lord Jesus Christ. There are, as we have seen, causes at work which tend to limit practically and enfeeble the authority of the Episcopate; but fidelity to the distinctive principles, doctrines, and discipline of the Church of England is not one of these. It is no source of weakness; it is a ground and necessary condition of strength." (pp. 51 to 53.)

The Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Pelham), in a letter addressed to the Church Association, dated 14th July, 1873, says :—

"I desire to express my entire sympathy with the anxiety of the memorialists in reference to the revival in our Church of doctrines and ceremonies, for which no warrant is to be found in the Word of God, which are a departure from the teaching and practice of the primitive Church and which our Church repudiated at the Reformation.

"I fully admit my responsibility as a Minister and a Bishop of the Church of England to use the authority and influence of my office to prevent and discourage the teaching of such doctrines and the use of such ceremonies, and to uphold the authority of the law, especially in such matters as have been the subject of legal decision, in all cases in which complaint is duly made and sufficient evidence is afforded."

The late Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce), in the debate in the House of Lords on the 15th July, 1873, said :—

"I hate and abhor the attempt to Romanize the Church of England."

The Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall) in his Charge, 1872, says:—

"The development which has been proceeding before our eyes during the last ten years has culminated in an approximation to Romish doctrine and ritual so close as to render the remaining interval hardly perceptible to common observers. Whether those who lead the van in this movement regard the position which they have taken up as one in which they could finally rest, or as a step toward an ulterior object, it would be useless to inquire. But they do not profess to be satisfied with the present amount of innovation, or to regard it as anything more than a beginning and an instalment. They make no secret of their desire and intention, so far as lies in their power, to bring about a complete transformation of the Church of England into the likeness of the Church of Rome in every particular, short of immediate submission to the Pope.

"After this it must be our own fault if we are not on our guard. But when the same persons put in 'a plea for Toleration,' I do not know how to illustrate the character of such a proposal more aptly than by the image suggested by one of themselves, in the words I was just now quoting, of 'two great camps.' It is as if one of these camps should send to the other some such message as this: 'We are on our march to take possession of your camp, and to make you our prisoners; but all we desire is that you should let us alone, and should not attempt to put any hindrance in our way.'"

The Bishop of Durham (Dr. Baring), in his answer to a Memorial from Morpeth, dated 3rd June, 1873, uses these words:—

"I do not doubt but that the Church Association by its prosecutions has accomplished a good and important work; it has vindicated the Protestant character of our Prayer-book, and has obtained a clear interpretation of the law of the Church upon several disputed points from the highest Court of Appeal. Although these decisions were at variance with their own judgment and wishes, many conscientious clergymen at once gave up their previous practices, that they might set an example of obedience to the law, and of loyalty to the Church of which they were ministers. But the very instances in which the Church Association obtained a favourable judgment have exhibited indisputable evidence that where there existed disloyalty to the Church of England and a yearning towards the doctrine and ritual of the Church of Rome, the practices condemned have, with some trivial change, been persisted in; and that no amount of legal proceedings will make the foolish, or the traitor to his Church, loyal, or the Jesuit honest."

Extract from the Charge of the Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Magee), 1872.

"Naturally, and necessarily, too, the Reformation which disowned and rejected many both of these doctrines and practices, is the object of their bitterest dislike—a dislike which no words of theirs seems strong enough to express. No one can deny—the most advanced members of the party do not themselves care to deny—that it is, in its latest development, marked by a close and even a servile imitation of all the minutest details of Roman Catholic ceremonials; a hankering after Romish theology and Romish forms of private devotion; an almost childish affectation of all the most Romish modes of thought and forms of expression; in short, as they themselves express it, by a 'deferential' 'latinising' of our Church; and to such an extent that one might not unfairly suppose that the one aim of such persons is to make themselves, in all respects, as like Romish priests as possible, and their greatest happiness is to be mistaken for such; and that the accusation which they would most keenly resent would be, that they were capable of

supposing that on any point whatever on which the Church of England differs from that of Rome, she can by any possibility be in the right.

"The calmness with which this demand is made for what is termed the right of the Catholic priesthood, but which is simply a license never so much as heard of before in any Church in Christendom, would be almost ludicrous were it not most seriously mischievous.

"A youthful priest—let us suppose—who has but recently passed an examination for holy orders, in which he may not perhaps have displayed any very profound acquaintance with theology or Church history, finds himself the fortunate possessor of a living, into which he has been inducted on the express condition that he 'assents to, and will use, the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer and none other, except so far as it may be ordered by lawful authority.' No sooner has he been duly inducted, than he proceeds to set up in his church the Roman mass in all its minutest details, of which lights, vestments, and incense are but a small part; he duly performs all the genuflexions, crossings, and prostrations prescribed in the last edition of his *Directorium*, or his *Ritual for the Altar*, adding to these, from time to time, such 'beautiful symbolism,' as may either occur to his own mind, or may have been recommended by some correspondent in his Church newspaper, as the last 'correct thing' in Ritualism. His parishioners, naturally indignant at this deliberate Romanising of their Church and their services—in which they, perhaps not altogether erroneously, believe that they have some rights, legal and ecclesiastical—remonstrate with him. He informs them, in reply, that he is a priest of the Holy Catholic Church, and that as such, it is his privilege to teach and direct them in all things, and their privilege to obey him. They complain to the Bishop, who, on writing to the incumbent to inquire into the truth of their complaints, receives in reply the information that all that has been complained of is quite true; that the writer does not intend to alter his proceedings in the very least particular, whatever his Bishop may say to the contrary; that as to his promise 'reverently to obey his ordinary,' that only means, that he is to obey such directions as the Bishop can enforce in a court of law; and that, at any rate, whatever obedience over and above this he might be disposed to pay to a really 'Catholic-minded' and 'properly-appointed Bishop,' he cannot possibly pay to one who is only 'the nominee of the Prime Minister,' and has neither 'the learning nor the piety,' nor 'the Catholic sympathies,' which alone would justify the obedience of a truly Catholic priest. Does his Bishop, in reply, remind him that he is not asking him to obey his directions only, but to obey the plain and clear law of the Church of England, his answer is either that the Church of England has not expressly forbidden the practices in question, and that he is entitled to do or say anything in public service which is not expressly forbidden; or, if this cannot be alleged, he asserts that these practices have been forbidden only in the Court of the Metropolitan, whose judgment he cannot possibly acknowledge, inasmuch as he sits there accompanied by a lay assessor,' or else by the Committee of the Privy Council, whose decisions are for him simply so much waste paper. . . . Finally, if his Bishop, having exhausted every effort of remonstrance, counsel, and even of entreaty, proceed at last to enforce the law and discipline of the Church of which he is a chief pastor, he is met by an indignant cry of tyranny and persecution, and fierce accusations of attempting to stamp out the liberties of the Catholic priesthood; followed, probably, by a denunciation of the hateful union between Church and State, by virtue of which, nevertheless, and of the legal status it gives him, this much-aggrieved priest alone possesses the legal power to defy his Bishop.

"Our Church cannot safely tolerate, she ought not to tolerate for a single day, those 'wilful and contemptuous transgressions' of her order and discipline which spring from hatred of her essential principles and disloyal denial of her claims on the obedience of her own children."

■ THERE POPERY IN THE PRAYER BOOK, HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED ?

LECTURE BY THE REV. T. P. BOULTBEE, LL.D.
PRINCIPAL OF THE LONDON COLLEGE OF DIVINITY, ST. JOHN'S
HALL, HIGHBURY, MIDDLESEX.

THE very asking the question now proposed for our consideration would have utterly astonished our forefathers of the last century. I am old enough to remember when plain Church people used commonly to speak of their religion simply as Protestantism. Often, in the early days of my ministry, when making my first acquaintance with parishioners, and therefore feeling it necessary to know what they were, I have asked whether they went to church or chapel, and have received the reply, "Oh, I am a Protestant"—meaning thereby a Churchman. Of course they would have admitted that their Wesleyan and Baptist neighbours professed the Protestant faith too. But the old English idea was distinctly that the Church of England was *the Protestant Church*, and Churchmen were *Protestants*. How it has come to pass that such a firm English notion should ever have been partially loosened, is a strange story, the telling of which in years to come will be a singular page in history.

However, that it is loosened is but too clear. The proposed question for our Lecture implies that some think that somehow, and somewhere, there is Popery in our Prayer Book. If there is, it will concern us to find out where it is, and who put it there, and why ; and whether they did it consciously or unconsciously ? If unconsciously, those who did it were either themselves in a muddle, or were not entirely free from the old system. If consciously, they were either dishonest men, or they yielded to influences they could not resist.

I am to consider the question historically. I fear I cannot calculate upon anything more than a vague and general knowledge of the history of the subject among my audience. I can only beg those on whom I may be inflicting tedious repetition, to pardon it for the sake of the less-informed. If I could read your minds I should know where a mere allusion would suffice, and where I must speak in full, as far as time may permit. But I am no clairvoyant.

Let us first go back to the very commencement of the Reformation, and let me remind you that there was scarcely any doctrinal change whatever in religion during the days of Henry VIII. There was a sort of a Pope at Windsor instead of a Pope at Rome, and not much more. Many outworks of mediæval superstition lay in ruins—the authority of the Pope in England, the monastic orders, the chantry priests, the prohibition of the English Bible, divers abuses, had been abolished. These made a reformation in religion more possible, but that reformation had not come. Then Edward VI., with his Protestant advisers, came into power; and in the year 1549 the first edition of our English Prayer Book was ordered to take the place of the old Latin service books. Doubtless there were things in that First Prayer Book of King Edward, especially in the offices for Baptism and the Communion, which would have made my present question much more difficult to answer if that first Prayer Book had been retained. Accordingly you see that the Ritualists petition Convocation that, in any Revision of the Prayer Book, the *First* Prayer Book of King Edward, and not the existing one, may be the model; and I shall presently show you why. Then, two years afterwards, in 1551, the Reformers saw their way to further changes, and the Second Prayer Book of King Edward was ordered to take the place of the First. Then followed the terrible episode of Mary's reign and then the accession of Elizabeth. In the first year of her reign, in 1559, the English Liturgy was restored. With slight modification, it was the Second Book of Edward which was adopted. It has been subjected to revision twice since then; but so little has the main body of the Liturgy been touched on those occasions, that I verily believe if, by any strange chance, an Elizabethan book should be used next Sunday, few of the worshippers would perceive much difference.

Before proceeding further with our subject we may pause just to glance at the nature of the leading difference between the First Prayer Book of Edward, and the Second, which is substantially the same as ours. It chiefly lies in the Offices for the two Sacraments. We know what our own Baptismal Service is. In the First Book of Edward there were three additional ceremonies: 1st. A Form of Exorcism. The Priest, "looking upon the children, was to say, "I command thee, unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants, whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath vouchsafed to call to His holy Baptism, to be made members of His body, and of His holy congregation. Therefore, thou cursed spirit, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgment, remember the day to be at hand wherein thou shalt burn in fire everlasting, prepared for thee and thy angels. And presume not hereafter to exercise any tyranny towards these infants, whom Christ hath bought with His precious blood, and by this His holy Baptism calleth to be of His flock." This, with more of the service, took place at the church-door; then the priest was directed to take one of the children by the right hand, and so

they were to go to the font. In the act of Baptism, the priest was to dip the child thrice. First the right side, then the left, then the face downward. Next the sponsors were to lay their hands on the child, and the minister put on it the white dress called the Chrisom—afterwards he was to anoint it. Now, whatever any one may think of these things, or whether he calls them Popery or not, it is clear that a great deal of ceremonial was cut away from the baptismal service by the Second book of Edward, that is to say, by our present book.

Now let us glance at the Communion Service. I will not weary you with details of verbal differences, though they are considerable, but I will notice, 1st. That an alb, with vestment or cope, was ordered to be worn by the officiating priest, which the recent judgment has pronounced to be illegal under our present system. 2nd. That auricular confession was recognized by name, though left optional. 3rd. The men were to sit on one side, the women on the other. 4th. Water was to be added to the wine. 5th. The departed in the faith, were commended in prayer to the mercy of God. 6th. The sign of the cross was made over the elements in the act of consecration. Again, I say, whatsoever we may think of these, they have all been swept away from the Second Book of Edward, and our present service. It ought to be added that even that first book forbade "any elevation or showing the sacrament to the people."

These matters of difference, then, we notice. But above all details must be observed the radical difference between the First and Second Books, produced by a simple interchange in the order of parts of the service. Nothing has been so bitterly lamented by the Ritualists as this. The "irreverence, ignorance, folly, malignity," of those who so altered the order, they are never weary of dilating upon. And again, without going into detail, the difference is this. You will observe that in our present service the consecration of the elements is reserved for the close of the service, that after consecration, the administration *immediately* follows without any kind of pause, excepting for the necessary movement of the communicants, and without any opportunity for adoration, or devotional recognition of the consecrated elements of any kind, and then when all have communicated two or three short acts of prayer and praise close the service. Now in that First Book, the consecration prayer follows upon, and is part of the prayer for the Church militant, and then the main part of the Communion Service itself comes in between the consecration and the administration. So that the consecrated elements were there present on "the altar" (as that book styles it) giving an opportunity for adoration to those who recognized the corporal presence. Now that was all swept away by the simple transposition of parts of the service, causing the administration to follow immediately upon the consecration, and both to occur, as nearly as might be, at the close of the service. It is clear, I think, that those who made these changes were at least aiming at casting out all Popery from the Prayer Book. After this brief and popular

glance at the subject, we have still to ask whether all Popery was cast out, or whether some was inadvertently left in, so that there is Popery in the Prayer Book. Observe, it is not the question whether things have been abused—whether the progress of time has shown that some additional precaution might be desirable—whether here or there an expression or an action might have been more wisely ordered; but whether there is Popery properly and essentially in the Prayer Book fairly understood as it was meant to be. Who is to judge? Are we to judge in this room? Or must Dr. Pusey, or Mr. Mackonochie, or Mr. Ryle, or Mr. Spurgeon? Because we shall get answers as different as possible from these gentlemen. The way in which our question is proposed, relieves us from this dubious mode of consulting contradictory oracles. We are to consider the question historically. I will briefly glance first at the answer which would have been given early in Elizabeth's reign by those ultra-Protestants, the first generation of the Puritans.

Any one at all conversant with these subjects is aware that many English exiles found shelter in Switzerland during Mary's reign, and that after their return to England they kept up a constant correspondence with the leading Swiss Reformers, especially those at Zurich. This voluminous correspondence has been carefully preserved in the archives of Zurich, and is constantly referred to by all writers on those times. It is very well known that from the very beginning of Elizabeth's reign, some of the advanced Puritans wrote to their Swiss friends, bitterly complaining of what they called dregs of Popery in the Church of England. Now what were these dregs? Out of a weary reiteration of complaints which seldom come to the point, I select a letter dated July, 1566, from Humphrey and Sampson, the leaders of the first English Puritans, to Bullinger, chief pastor of Zurich. It chiefly discusses the question how far it was lawful for a Christian minister to wear the dress enjoined by the Church of England. And then it says, "We have (praised be God!) *a doctrine pure and incorrupt*. Why should we go halting in regard to divine worship, which is not the least important part of religion?" We find appended to the letter a schedule specifying the writers' chief complaints. I will read all the part bearing on our subject in full, that every one may fully know what these acute critics and ardent Protestants at that day were able to put together as the strongest case against the Church of England. It is entitled:—

"Some blemishes which still attach to the Church of England.

1. "In the public prayers, although there is nothing impure, there is however a kind of popish superstition, which may not only be seen in the morning and evening service, but also in the Lord's Supper."

Upon this we can only say that it is impossible to deal with such vague words. Judging by the more detailed objections of other Puritans, the "kind of Popish superstition" consisted chiefly in using responses, kneeling to receive the Lord's Supper,

and so on. People may or may not like such arrangements, but to call them Popery is childish.

2. "To say nothing of the effeminate and over refined strains of the music itself, the use of the organ in church is growing more common."

We should add now-a-days, "the use of the organ in chapels." Anyhow there is no organ in the Prayer Book, so that does not touch us.

3. "In the administration of baptism the minister addresses the infant; in whose name the sponsors, in the absence of the parent, make answer concerning faith and renouncing the world, the flesh, and the devil. The person baptized is signed with the sign of the cross."

On this I beg you to notice that no objection whatever is made to the *doctrine* of the Baptismal service, only to this mode of taking the covenant.

4. "Licence is also given to women to baptize in private houses." That is not in the Prayer Book, be it Popery or not.

5. "The sacred habits, namely the cope and the surplice, are used at the Lord's Supper; kneeling is enjoined to those who communicate, and an unleavened cake is distributed for common bread."

The surplice and the kneeling remain, the last is disused, the Prayer Book tells us to use good ordinary bread.

6. "The Popish habits are ordered to be worn out of Church, and by ministers in general." That again is not in the Prayer Book, nor indeed now anywhere else.

7. "There is no discipline, neither has our Church its rod, or any exercise of superintendence." This may be laxity, but it is not Popery.

8. "The marriage of the clergy is not allowed and sanctioned by the public laws of the kingdom." We cannot complain of that now.

9. "Solemn betrothal takes place after the Popish method by the giving of a ring." We may grant this and not feel very Papistical.

10. "Women continue to wear a veil when they come to be church'd." The Prayer Book does not say so.

11. Relates to abuses of the ecclesiastical courts, in which I heartily sympathise with the complainants, but then these are not in the Prayer Book.

12. Relates to impediments then placed in the way of preaching.

13. Complains that the rubric about spiritual eating, which denied the corporal presence had been removed. However it has since been restored, so that objection falls through.

Now I have to say this,—If ever men knew Popery well, these did. They knew it as a man knows his enemy, with whom he has been at sword's point, or in deadly grapple; into whose eyes he has gazed and marked the deadly hate concentrated there. And yet of all the hateful lineaments of Popery these were all they could recognise. The doctrine they confess is pure, and

these are the sum of their objections. Not a word against the Absolution, or the Baptismal doctrine, or any of the matters familiar to us. On the sum of the controversies familiar to us in our day, I must say that the verdict of those early Puritans must be—There is no Popery in the Prayer Book.

But I pass on to particular things, which since those days have been extensively objected to and charged with Popery, and I will endeavour to allege the opinion of some of those who knew Popery best, and are supposed to be typical Protestants. Men whose names are continually abused as being at the opposite pole to the Church of England, or anything that is Catholic. Such men as Calvin, John Knox, Baxter, and others I might allege; or, which will be more convenient and decisive, we may take the Westminster Confession of Faith, the authorized formula of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, and (considering its history) what we may call double-distilled Protestantism. Let us glance at our Communion Service with this Protestant light thrown upon it. Does our Service say of the unworthy receivers that they "are guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour and eat and drink their own damnation." The Presbyterian formula says that the wicked "by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord to their own damnation." (29, 8.) Do we call the sacramental emblems "*holy mysteries*." So does the Confession (29, 8) use the expression "partake of these holy mysteries." Do we use such expressions as this: "Then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood, we are one with Christ and Christ with us." The Confession hesitates not to say—"Worthy receivers outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of His death; the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in with or under the bread and wine, yet as really but spiritually present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses." If there were such a person as a Presbyterian Mackonochie what might he not make of that with a few judicious epithets, such as supralocal, supernatural, and the like? when so much has been made of the two or three simple words in the Church Catechism—"The body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Again I need not remind you of the words which the minister pronounces when administering the elements in the Lord's Supper in our Service. But what does the Presbyterian Directory order its ministers to say? "Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Him;" and in like manner with the cup. But I ought first to have noticed the consecration. We have a prayer, simple and beautiful, which is called consecrating the elements. The Presbyterian Confession (29, 5) says that "the outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such

relation to Him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ." These are a few specimens which might be carried much further. If there is Popery in our Communion Service, there is also in the Presbyterian formulas. And if it is there, where is it *not*?

A glance next at the Baptismal Service. I grant that none of our formularies has been so much abused in a papistical direction; that none has been more freely attacked as Popish by our dissenting critics. But I deny altogether that there was a legitimate opening for the abuse, or a sound basis for the criticism to a well taught theologian. I might grant that to modern ears there is ambiguity, and that experience may have suggested the expediency of some modification. But beyond this I will not go. I appeal to the same authorities. Those Puritans of early times, those ultra-Protestants, those acute theologians, those strong Calvinists and determined Presbyterians, they who could detect Popery in the hem of a surplice or the four corners of the ecclesiastical cap, they who felt their weak point to be that the doctrine of the book was pure, and they could not deny it.—These had the Baptismal Service before them, and they carped at some things; they did not like the cross; they objected to the questions put to the sponsors; they were indignant at lay-people baptizing; but not a word had they to say about the doctrine of Regeneration in the Service. We shall presently show why. They were far too good theologians not thoroughly to understand that a thing sacramentally present and a thing spiritually present were not always coincident.

But, before touching further on that, let us briefly ask what is the Popish doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism. I will take the Catechism of the Council of Trent and produce these extracts. "That infants when baptized receive the mysterious gifts of faith, it is not lawful to doubt." "No other means of salvation remains for infant children but baptism." "By the admirable virtue of baptism sin is remitted and pardoned whether originally contracted from our first parents, or actually committed by ourselves, however great its enormity." "That an innate predisposition to sin remains, must be confessed, but this does not really possess the nature of sin." "The soul also is replenished with divine grace, and grace is a certain splendour and light, that effaces all the stains of our souls, and renders the souls themselves brighter and more beautiful." To this is added a most noble train of all virtues, which are divinely infused into the soul with grace. Really, I may ask, where in all our Formularies we have any such contradiction of all our experience as this? I suppose it will be replied you have it wrapped up closely in the word *Regenerate*. Very closely indeed! A very small compass to hold so much. We will examine it as before. We will consider whether we say more than the Presbyterian Directory and Formularies do. First I note that they are very particular about the minister. They say

that "Baptism is not to be administered in any case by any private person, but by a minister of Christ called to be the steward of the *mysteries* of God." Next I note that we have a simple prayer that God will wash and sanctify the child with His Holy Spirit, and give it remission of sins by spiritual regeneration. And we also pray that God will sanctify that water to the mystical washing away of sin—*i.e.*, the figurative, symbolical representation of a spiritual act.

Now I turn to the Presbyterian Directory. The minister is directed to instruct the people that "the water in Baptism representeth and signifieth both the blood of Christ which taketh away all guilt of sin, original and actual, and the sanctifying virtue of the Spirit of Christ against the dominion of sin and the corruption of our sinful nature." Moreover, that "Baptism is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our ingrafting into Christ, and of our union with Him: of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternal."

Then also it is enjoined—"Prayer is to be joined with the words of institution, for *sanctifying the water to this spiritual use.*" Then the minister is to pray that God would "make this baptism to the infant a seal of adoption, remission of sin, regeneration, and eternal life." So far, there is really no difference. But there is an expression in our service occurring twice after the administration which has been made to bear all the brunt of controversy, and which seems to go beyond the Presbyterian formula. We say, "Seeing this child is regenerate;" and we thank God that it has pleased Him to "regenerate the child with His Holy Spirit." It has often been shown that this is no more than the language of faith and charity, just as in the other sacrament we thank God "for that He has vouchsafed to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Christ." And I will show you that the Presbyterian Confession says what is practically the same of Baptism in the case of those who are God's elect. It says, "the efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time when it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, *by the right use of this ordinance*, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and *conferred, by the Holy Ghost*, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time."

In short, I may sum up my comments upon this topic thus. When, about the time of the great Civil War and the Restoration, our divines began to speak of Regeneration in Baptism apart from the consideration of the electing grace of God, a difference at once arose about it. But, before that time, you can scarcely find any doctrinal objection raised by the strongest Antipapist to the *language* of our service, as distinguished from its arrangements. This cannot be better illustrated historically than by noting the tone of the comments made by Richard Baxter and his Puritan colleagues at the Savoy Conference in 1661, when negotiating for some alterations in the Prayer Book. Their "fifteenth excep-

tion" is generally, not only in the Baptismal service, that "the phrase" of the Liturgy "presumes all persons (within the communion of the Church) to be regenerated, converted, and in a state of grace," which they said, in the absence of strict discipline, was too much to assume. In other words, they objected that the Church assumes these worshippers to be Christians.

With regard to the apparent assertion of regeneration in Baptism, they afterwards, in their Rejoinder to the Bishops, enter more fully into the question. They say of it: "Baptism, as an outward administration, is our visible sacramental regeneration. Baptism, as containing with the sign, the thing signified, is our spiritual real regeneration." After some further discussion they dismiss this topic with the words, "But we are not willing to make more ado about words than needs." (Rejoinder, § 6.) And further (§ 7), they seem distinctly to object to the apparently general assertion of the baptismal regeneration of infants only in the case where the parents are unbelievers; they seem quite willing to use the words as to the children of believing parents.

So feebly, judged by modern standards, did the learned and devout Baxter, and the other Commonwealth divines urge their doctrinal objections to our baptismal service. Contrast this with certain popular dissenting leaders, charging Evangelical clergy with wholesale hypocrisy for using this service, with the meaning which our Reformers intended when it was first composed.

I conclude, therefore, again historically, that whether every expression in our service is quite safely worded or not (which is quite a different thing) there is no Popery in it, nor anything more than the principle admitted in the Presbyterian Confession, to which I beg a very close attention, as it is the key to much theological confusion. "There is in every sacrament, a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."

There is one more subject upon which I am bound to touch; and that is, the Absolution in the service for the Visitation of the Sick, and the sentence used in the ordination of priests. The Bishop says to him, "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Also the Absolution referred to runs in these words. "By His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Whether our reformers were wise in using this language—whether they ought to have said, it is a dangerous expression, and it is certain to be abused, all this is another question, and not my subject. All I am now concerned with is to show that there is no Popery in this as it was meant. I know not how this may be more distinctly set forth than in the contemporary work of Bishop Jewel, "The Apology for the Church of England," published 1562, with the approval of the whole Church, and referred to with approbation in the Thirtieth Canon. He thus defines the ministerial powers of absolution. "We say that Christ has

given to His ministers power to bind, to loose, to open, to shut, and that the office of loosing consisteth in this point, that the minister should either offer by the preaching of the Gospel, the merits of Christ, and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent them, pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins, and hope of everlasting salvation; or else that the minister, when any have offended their brothers' minds with a great offence, and with a notable and open fault, whereby they have as it were banished and made themselves strangers from the common fellowship and from the body of Christ, then after perfect amendment of such persons, doth reconcile them, and bring them home again, and restore them to the company and unity of the faithful." In short Jewel recognizes two branches of this office. First, the pardon of God fully offered in the preaching of the Gospel. Second, the Absolution from any Church censure of discipline under which an offender may lie. There is scarcely a sect on earth that does not fully admit both these. And now whether our Church has wisely worded this part of her office or not I will not say. But I shall probably surprise some very much when I read precisely parallel words from the formulary of ultra-Protestantism—the Westminster Confession (Chap. XXX.) "The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of His Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent both by word and censure; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censure, as occasion shall require."

Here, also, I will connect this subject with Richard Baxter and his coadjutors at the Savoy Conference of 1661, the last attempt to unite the Church in England. You will find that they, great divines but uncompromising Protestants, men of the solemn League and Covenant, had, indeed, something to say about this Absolution formula, but by no means what a modern Dissenter or timid Churchman would expect. When they comment upon it, are they indignant? Do they denounce it, or demand its total excision? No; this is the line they take: they recommend, in their exceptions, that there be more license to the minister to use or omit the Absolution as he shall see occasion. They also recommend that the form be, "I pronounce thee absolved," instead of "I absolve thee"—"if thou dost truly repent and believe." To which the Bishops readily replied that the Scripture's words are, "whose sins ye remit"—not "whose sins ye pronounce remitted; and the condition needs not to be expressed, being always necessarily understood." It is manifest again that modern dissent takes very different ground from those whom a wise comprehension might have retained in our Church two hundred years ago; and that, to say the least, no Popish interpretation was intended, and none need, or ought to be given to these passages now.

Baxter and his coadjutors would have been surpassed in Protestant fervour by no modern low Churchman, if they had deemed this sentence necessarily and in itself Popish. Their demand would have been: "Away with this intrusion into the priestly office of Christ towards His Church!" That their tone was so different, shows how different was their understanding of the words.

Time will not allow me to go at greater length into these matters. The principal things objected to have been touched upon and dealt with as completely as time would allow. Two results will, I trust, remain with you.

First, you may come to the conclusion that there is a far stronger doctrinal affinity between the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and our own than you may have ever suspected, and that our Protestantism really stands on a common basis. If I have not noticed the great and powerful modern English sects, it has been simply because they have no authorized theology. They mercilessly assail ours; but, if we would attack them in return, there is no theological citadel into which to direct our shot; and if we would defend ourselves by pointing out similarities and coincidences of doctrinal belief in them, there is no formulary from which we may select. They used to admit as a standard the doctrinal Articles of our Church; do they now?

The second result is this. We are not to be carried away by peremptory assertions about the identity of certain doctrines as taught by the Church of Rome and the Church of England, whether those assertions come from Romanizing Churchmen or controversial dissenters. It may be there is a lack of caution in some of our expressions. It may be that time has revealed certain weak places in the wording of our formularies. And it may be that to remodel these passages in close conformity with their original intention would at present be impossible. What then? We must know, and we must be able to defend their original meaning, the meaning with which they were inserted by our Reformers; the meaning with which they were accepted for at least a hundred years by some of the most devoted Protestants the world has known. We must not allow ourselves to be brow-beaten by those who claim to interpret these things in a Romanist sense; and who arrogate to themselves almost exclusively the title of Churchmen. Rely upon it the Prayer Book is ours, if we do but understand it. How could it not be ours? We sympathize with those who compiled it, and who died a bitter death for faithfulness to its teaching. Aye, and the extreme party witness to the truth of what I have advanced. They cannot find in our Prayer Book, doctrine or ceremonial to hear out their opinions. And, therefore, services and ritual are, as all know, freely borrowed from Romish manuals and unblushingly interpolated in, or substituted for our own. And yet they who do these things are called high Churchmen, and we are either low Churchmen or scarcely Churchmen at all!

The absurdity (to say the least) of such a position cannot

endure. Some purgation, some reparation, some final adjustment of our relations cannot be very long delayed.

Finally, we must remember that our authorized standard of doctrine is really the Thirty-nine Articles. If the language of devotion in the Prayer Book has not always escaped perversion, I think the Thirty-nine Articles as nearly incapable of it as human words can be, and I would appeal to the miserable and contemptible quibbling of Tract Ninety to prove how little susceptible they are of wrongful handling. Finally, when I remember that Popery fastens itself on the words of Holy Scripture itself, and when I call to mind what Popery makes of these simple words—"This is my body"—"Thou art Peter," and "Feed my sheep"—I learn that no system of words only can exclude it. It is the mighty power of evil; and nothing but the Spirit of God Himself can lift up a standard against it.

May that Holy Spirit breathe into all our hearts with His gracious influences.—A Spirit of Power, of Love, and of a Sound Mind. Power instead of weakness, Power of Faith, of Mind, of Heart—Power that believes, understands, and grasps the Truth. Love that embraces God and His Word, and Man and his eternal interests in its mighty grasp of divine sympathy. A Sound Mind that weighs the Truth of God, in the balances of a divinely enlightened reason, and is able to give an answer to every man that asketh of the hope that is in us. This is the divine gift. Unbelief may bring its darkness. Superstition may dazzle and bewilder with its false lights. But holding forth the Word of life, God's true Church, taught, led, and enlightened by His Spirit, shall still be the light of the world during its days of trial, and the time may not be long till He shall come before whose face all shadows shall flee away, and we shall no longer see as through a glass darkly, but face to face shall behold the Truth Eternal!

NOTE.

The foregoing lecture, delivered before the Bennett Judgment, has been entirely confirmed by that remarkable decision. That Judgment distinctly enunciated the Protestant doctrine of the Lord's Supper as that which alone "the Church, by her Articles and Formularies affirms or requires her ministers to accept." It proceeds to say that the question as to the defendant, was not "what the Articles and Formularies affirm, but what they exclude." The Court decided that it was just possible to understand Mr. Bennett to mean something not absolutely and verbally forbidden. On the ground of this alleged ambiguity of words they refused to condemn him, only censuring him for "rash and ill-judged" expressions.

In other words the lecture is confirmed by the Bennett Judgment. It pronounced on the matter then in debate, "that there is no Popery in the Prayer Book," but that the language of the Prayer Book and Articles has failed to *exclude* Popery, introduced under the veil of cautious ambiguity, and interpreted in the most favourable light. In old times Englishmen used to say what they meant and defend it. What spirit is this which eludes examination, and escapes by the artifice of the chameleon?

THE RELATION OF SOUNDNESS IN THE FAITH TO SPIRITUALITY IN THE LIFE.

BY REV. J. RICHARDSON, M.A., VICAR OF ST. MARY'S,
BURY ST. EDMUNDS.

SPIRITUALITY in the life is the greatest purpose which religion is intended to promote in man. And any system which fails in this, breaks down at the most critical point. For man, the sinner, is not only to be saved—rescued from the dreadful situation to which sin has brought him—but he is also to be sanctified, fitted for that glorious position to which the Lord Jesus will advance all who come unto God by Him. And the pure Gospel is fitted to accomplish this. The Saviour's own prayer implies that, when He said, "Sanctify them through Thy truth, Thy word is truth." Thus, our minds are to be turned to-day to a very practical question—the relation and connection which are found to exist, between soundness in the faith and spirituality in the life. No more interesting subject could be offered—and it needs to be handled in a very loving spirit. Spirituality in the life should of itself eliminate all bitterness, all narrowness, all captiousness in the discussion of such a subject; and I shall endeavour carefully to guard against everything hollow in argument and hard in expression, in saying what I have to say to my brethren on a matter which we all are most anxious to grasp and master.

Many an earnest minister of Christ is mourning, wondering over the want of spirituality in his people. Many a servant of Christ is grieving over the want of spirituality in his own soul. There is coldness, deadness, rigidity; and the servant of God wishes to find warmth, life, freshness, activity in himself, and others. And it may be, by God's good hand upon us, that coming together as brethren, we may strike out some thought which may explain and enable us to deal with the practical causes out of which the mischief springs.

Now, I think I see a relation between soundness in the faith and spirituality in the life.

I.—*In the matter of the confession of sin.* And here let me express my conviction that men who take very different views from myself

upon this matter have a real desire and a strong determination to promote spirituality. I think they must be disappointed, and believe that they are mistaken; but their motives must not be questioned if ever candid inquiry is to be given to this most solemn question. Let us be outspoken, but open-hearted, faithful to the verge of the Revelation platform; but tender, to very tearfulness, towards men who are really endeavouring to contend against sin. But suppose a man to believe that it is the purpose and plan of God, that the confession of sin is to be made through a creature—the Church aggregate in its members, or represented by its ministers—that man, however sincere in this conviction, is wrong as to his view of the Gospel system, and his errors have an influence against the spirituality which he wishes to promote. Because, when the sinner is brought down into the presence of his fellow sinners he must lose, and he does lose much of the awful and solemn realities of sin itself. Lift him up as high as you can, put him distinctly and without an escape under the all-searching eye of God, take him out of the littlenesses of man, and leave him before the majesty, and holiness, and mercifulness of his Maker; and so you will make him understand, that to confess must be to be thoroughly contrite, really ashamed and alarmed, absolutely and entirely sincere in the feeling and in the expression of his horror and hatred concerning sin.

Take that same sinner to a man fallible and frail as himself, a man who can read only the externals of look and language, things which may express but also may conceal emotion, a man who may interpret the sin according to its offence against man more than its enormity against God, and you lower every part of his exercise of soul. The penitent may become prostrated and chilled to the centre of his conscience, he may be trampled upon in his own notion by the knowledge that a fellow man has seen the defilement and the deformity of his spiritual self. But this is not spirituality. The tendency in such a heart is to close, not to open. You are forging letters such as God has never named. And every effort made to remedy the known defects of any human search does but make the matter worse. The probe is poisoned, because it has come from contact with some spirit still more diseased; and the very questions of the confessor do but suggest the very corruption which he may in all honesty be desiring to prevent. The history of the confession is a record of retrogression in all ages and departments of the Church. And the rationale of the confessional is the explanation that it is and it must be so. Some bodies of Christian men have said, Confess your experiences; others have said, Confess your sins to the Church. Our own wiser and more scriptural exhortation is, "Let a man examine himself." The

sound faith leads the sinner into the presence of the God of love leaves him thus without any creature between man and majesty, puts the spirit within before the spirit above, and the result is that the real questions are raised with which God means to deal,—the real answers are given which man has no power to keep back,—religion is lifted up out of the shams and subterfuges amongst which it tries to hide, and it becomes that earnest, honest thing of the heart and conscience,—that bright and transparent thing of truth and trustfulness, which God means it to be in every human soul into which His Grace has put it.

With all your care, you cannot make artificial light do the work of the light from heaven—and with all your efforts you will have failure and disappointment, because your carnal processes do not and cannot secure the spiritual results you look for. But, if you stand in the presence of men, full in the light of God's revealed word, and there point that the Great Spirit in Heaven is searching the precious spirit of man on earth—you may look for God's blessing on your words of truth and find that God's power has indeed been put forth—and men who once were carnal, grovelling, serving divers lusts and passions will be found full of the Spirit—alive in their soul—acquainted with the worship which is in spirit and in truth. It is damaging to the soul—dangerous to the Church—and distressing to all who know anything about the life of God in the soul of man,—when men are drawing poor sinners to the tribunal of a man, when they ought to be standing in the presence chamber of God, to confess only, always, everything to Him. And, I am persuaded that if ever, in this highly favoured land, in our greatly honoured Church, there should come in the system of an expected or an enforced confession unto men, the immediate effect will be a drooping and a barrenness over all the garden; and the ultimate result would come of a deadening and disgusting blight, which would make our Church as much a shame as it has been a glory in Christendom. You may squeeze out corruption under the pressure of confession to man: but you can only distil the essences and the aromatics of pure spiritual sorrow and service, when you put the soul under subtler influence which comes from direct contact and communion with God.

The relation for which this paper is meant to contend is seen also:—

II.—*In the matter of Communion with Christ.* Some men seem to hold communion only with the *man* Christ Jesus. It is all humanity, his beautiful life—his loving heart—his noble faithfulness—his diligent devotedness to doing good. But you will not get spirituality out of that. You may get a dreamy sentimentality under which you will really find the dregs and lees of a carnal selfish life—as when a

man draws beautiful pictures of home as it may be conceived to be, and then lets his wife and children know by a bitter experience what a dreamer's home-life is. You may get a dead and dreary melancholy; as when a man has endeavoured to copy the Christly character, and has thrown down his pencil in disgust and despair, because his imitation has been so wretchedly out of proportion and out of place. You may get a harsh, stern asceticism, in which a man prides himself on some self-denial, which means but little, and then, Pharisee-like, begins to rail at the Publican, who really has an honest and an anxious heart. But spirituality comes out of knowledge of our Spiritual Head,—the God-man Christ Jesus. Therefore, it is out of such subjects as the atoning work—pardon through the blood—life because of the death—salvation, had, enjoyed, known—that the Spirit, the soul of man is lifted up into a higher region of love, and praise, and worship. All mere rationalistic views and teachings must fail, do fail, ever have failed in the matter, of that higher, holier life which is implied in what is here called spirituality.

Some men seem to hold communion with Christ mainly in sacraments, and symbols, and ceremonies; and these will be also found to fail in the thing they may earnestly seek to reach—spirituality of life and heart. The very genius of the Gospel is simplicity—great facts and truths simply appropriated and taken home by a living faith which the Holy Ghost has put within.

There is, for instance, beautiful simplicity in the fact that the Lord Jesus has ascended up with His human body, and is at the right hand of the Majesty in the Heavens. My mind can grasp that idea and use it to enjoyment and edification. It lifts thought and heart heavenwards. The fleshly eye may not follow; but the eye of faith does find Jesus there—a forerunner, a friend, a firm hand-hold to which I can cling, be the shakings of my foot-hold on earthly things what they may. But if I am made to believe that the body of the Lord is upon a material table, in dependence upon words spoken by a man, my spiritual instincts are outraged, my upward thoughts are checked as if some frost had blighted them. I come down into the acquiescence of a devotee—the unquestioning obedience of a dependent upon another's mind and will. This may be called devotion, but it is not spirituality. And we see it in practical effect. How comes it that a man is most careful to receive fasting—as if the condition of his body were most carefully to be considered;—and yet will receive after some midnight revelry, in which the condition of the soul can have had but small attention? Is it not because the sacramental dogma has tended more to the idea of a fleshly than of a soul intercourse between him and Christ? It is the same thing

which accounts for the awe-stricken look, and the prostrate form, and the scrupulously gathered crumb, and the carefully arranged hands—materialism everywhere. There ought to be the radiant, uplifted, heaven-reflecting eye, the happy, hopeful, thankful face—the spirit, soul, breathing out of the every sense, as if the man were more of heaven than of earth as his soul is lifted up in conscious communion with his Lord. The multiplication of forms has always attended a deterioration of worship. The living religion has the freshness of life, which is its own ornament; but the religion in its grave-clothes needs the artificial adornments of flowers and furbishings, which are there because they cover decay and call away our thoughts from the death that lies below. You may work up excitement, superstition, party spirit, fear, fanaticism, by the sacramental and sacerdotal system of a grand ceremonial, and services which show much of man; but spirituality is a thing of far subtler character, and it will escape in the midst of all these coarser things, and leave the Church and the conscience alike cold and dark and dull. This system is growing up amongst us with an alarming rapidity; but it is a thing of deadly growth. We must not encourage our brethren to tamper with it, or use soft and weak words about it. It is no new thing in our Church. Two centuries ago it came up as it is coming up now. It wrought out results which are matters of history. No age so immoral, so spiritually cold, can be pointed out, as that which followed, after that former endeavour to bring back ritualism into our Reformed Church. We are warned, we are instructed by the past, and if we would be kind to our neighbours, who are busy in this dangerous enterprise—if we would be true to our own souls and the souls of our people, over which this blight seems ready to come—if we would be faithful to God, who has put us in trust of the pure Gospel, in order that we should hand it down in its integrity to the ages which are yet to come, we must be wise enough, bold enough to say, that spirituality is the great effect which we have to seek, and that it cannot follow from any system which puts man or ordinances between the Saviour and the soul.

My third observation as to the relation between sound doctrine and spirituality of life is made:—

III.—*In the matter of fellowship with the Holy Ghost.* The apostle Paul has connected the two things together where he says, “through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.” And the fact will easily come out on careful examination. Now spirituality of mind is the direct result of the power of the Holy Ghost upon the soul. It is only an evidence and fruit of the life which the Spirit has given. The unconverted man has no spirituality.

"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." Now take the case of a man who teaches that life in the soul is always given when baptism by water has been administered. Such a man is assuming as reality what may be most unreal. He is talking about life, and looking for its fruits, while no life has been given. If it be not true that there is the Spirit in that baptized person; it cannot be true that there is the spirituality in him. You may threaten, or persuade, terrify or coax such a man to be outwardly correct and ecclesiastically submissive; but the very first principle of spirituality has yet to be imparted to him. Mistaken views which these give as to the communication of the Holy Ghost must be very closely associated with disappointed hopes as to communion with the Spirit. A man who has right views about the divine person of the Holy Ghost may yet assume that He works in external ordinances and sacraments in a way which neither Scripture nor experience will justify—and he will be tempted to put a meaning upon spirituality level with the low results which his system of doctrines compels him to sink to—and the higher real character of that moral change of heart and soul which the Holy Ghost works in the man that He quickens will be overlooked, and assigned only as the mark of the favoured few, and not to be as the very essence and nature of the life of God in the soul of man.

But another type of error comes up where the distinct personality and divine nature of the Holy Ghost are not accepted or understood. If we believe that the Holy Ghost is only an influence—speak of the third person as "it" and not as "He"—if we hold that inspiration concerning truth is alike in quality though not in quantity in the poet as in the prophet—if we think that regeneration means the cultivation of the better emotions and instincts of man's natural heart—then we are grieving, dishonouring the Spirit—and deluding and misrepresenting the sinner himself. Is spirituality to be taken as the "love of God"—realized love from God or returned love to God; we are to remember "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Is it to be taken as holy consecration to the Lord; we, "through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the flesh." "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." The truth is, that one great chapter in the history of the soul and of salvation work has been left out in the reckonings of some men. And we need some earnest, and immediate, and direct dealings with the whole crop of errors and mischiefs which has grown up of late years, not in one

branch, but in many, of the outward professing Church, from erroneous or inadequate teachings about the Deity and the special operations of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit in the giving of life—in the revelation of Jesus—in the creation of prayer—in the imparting of comfort—in the direction of effort—in the sole communication of real spiritual success, must be more honoured, more enjoyed, more respected, more praised. Full of the Holy Ghost—walking in the Spirit—led of the Spirit—living in the Spirit: such are the holy ideas which the word of God has given about a real sanctification and a true spirituality of heart, and thought, and life. “Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with ■ price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are His.” This is the dispensation of the Spirit—the Holy Ghost has come and not gone back—and there will be no spirituality in a soul or in ■ church, when this truth is not known and loved.

IV.—*In the question of the standard by which Spirituality is measured.* That may be a world's standard, or a Church's standard, or a standard which God himself has given. The world's standard has risen or fallen according as vital religion has advanced or retrograded in the world; but it has never yet come up to the level on which the child of God must stand in his very first coming out of the mire and clay, to take his place upon the rock that the Lord may order his goings. If there be respectability, morality, orthodoxy, observance of times, forms, ordinances of worship—if there be amiability, honour, usefulness, charitableness, the world's standard has nothing to record against the professor who so serves Christ.

The Church standard in its purest days has been in harmony and coincidence with all that God requires. But it has happened, and it may happen again, that to be devoted to a system may be mistaken for devotion to truth. If, for instance, submission to authority in the Church, zeal in its defence, liberality in its support, high position in its services, constant attendance on its ordinances shall become more an end than a means of life, the Church life has come down from the things which be of God to the things which be of man. There is much reason to apprehend that there is very much miscalculation in this direction in this our own day. Adornment of fabrics, multiplication of services, elevation of all that is connected with truth, and skill, and order and propriety, may not be concurrent with higher and holier worship. And Church defence, Church extension, Church reform, may all go on, and yet the Church life and influence be low. We want more humility of soul, more con-

tact in our living soul with the living Saviour, more communication of grace and strength by the Holy Ghost. These things must be in our thoughts, in our hearts, in our prayers, in our talk, in our life, and the spirituality in act will rise with the spirituality of idea, expectation and desire. Hence is the importance of that standard which God has himself given as to what a Christian is to be. Now that standard goes deeper than men may think. It will not stand on the debris of many former failures; but it is to be erected on the bare rock, from which all creature righteousness has been removed. It begins with Jesus accepted, made our own by a living and true faith. It goes below the surface and deals with the hidden man of the heart. It tests not only acts but motives, not only practices but principles. It is God's own trial what each man really is in God's sight.

Then it rises far higher than many men are prepared to acknowledge. It begins with a desire to please God out of that deep gratitude which follows, when pardon of sin has been realized and peace of conscience felt. It rises into a pleasure in serving God, when His law is found to be holy, and just, and good, and His service is known to be perfect freedom. It advances into a desire to be like God—when holiness and happiness are discovered to be of one kindred and concomitant growth. It continues to ascend in a yearning desire to be with God—will parallel with God's word, heart filled with God's presence, hopes gilded with God's promises, Faith with her wing feathers in full growth, standing on the upper height to which the hand of Jesus has guided and lifted her up, ready to take heavenly flight, to be absorbed in the facts and realities of the upper world, and the eternal existence in which Saint and Saviour are to be face to face. The barometer of Gospel truth will be found to be in harmony with the thermometer of Gospel holiness. And soundness in the faith will be found to have a relationship to spirituality in the life, such as a right reckoning has to a true course, and a sound heart has to a healthy circulation. Raise the right standard—insist on the higher tone—reckon upon all the opposition—realize all the grace and strength, and you will find the courage, the morale, the might, the majesty, the principles of the Christian army to be more conspicuous and encouraging day by day.

GUILDS.

By THE REV. G. W. WELDON, VICAR OF ST. SAVIOUR'S,
CHELSEA.

THE subjects for our proposed discussion are—First, Why were Guilds and Sisterhoods discontinued at the Reformation? and, secondly, Do they promote the growth of spiritual life? There is a third question which arises out of the second. Did these organizations promote spiritual life in the olden time, before the Reformation? These are the topics for our discussion.

The time is so very limited that it would be impossible for me to notice all these points. They extend over a very wide range and therefore wholly beyond my power to touch them all. Having already read a paper at the May Conference of the Church Association upon Sisterhoods, and as it has been published in the *Monthly Intelligencer*, I hope I may be excused if on this occasion I confine myself entirely to the subject of Guilds, and endeavour to place such facts before you as may enable you to form your own conclusion as to whether they do now and did formerly promote the growth of pure and spiritual religion in the soul or the contrary.

It is worthy of notice that the various Guilds of old always arose in times of transition. History points out this fact very clearly. I am sorry I can do no more in this paper as to matters of historical interest connected with Guilds than to speak of them in general terms. If any person should like to pursue the matter further he will find much valuable information from any books which treat upon the history of the Middle Ages.

The subject for our proposed discussion will be found, I fear, somewhat dry. And yet I hardly know how to deal with it in a sober and serious manner. It is incrustated with so much of the superstitions and eccentricities of the dark ages, that if I were to enter into detail I might without difficulty upset the gravity of our meeting.

I have said that Guilds always arose in times of transition. Now I think we shall all agree that the present time is without doubt a transitional period. Accordingly we find that there has been a shaking among the old bones of Mediævalism. Men whose taste for Church-work leads them to adopt a retrograde movement, find great delight in rummaging among the dust of the Dark Ages. Surely, then, they cannot reasonably be surprised if men of progress—men imbued with Gospel principles—men who thank God for the blessings of the Reformation, should, as we do here this day, endeavour to sprinkle a few drops of water upon the rising dust. We want to see all things clearly and to prevent, if possible, any thing obscuring the glorious and inestimable privileges of an open Bible and a Scriptural Church. Men who know and value the truth and the power of the Gospel and its free sovereign grace through Jesus Christ to sinful man, can afford to look without alarm on the novel or the revived appliances of Ritualism. A baseless superstition that knows the weakness of its own foundations and that fears to have them exposed, may justly shudder at the progress of the human mind. The instinct of self-preservation is upon her. Deriving her grandeur from the surrounding obscurity she instinctively dislikes and denounces every kind of light in her neighbourhood. But Protestant Christianity is a child of the light and of the day. Its origin, its profession, its principles, and above all—its Bible, lead its disciples to knowledge and to free enquiry. Our heart's desire is that men should walk round about Zion, count well her bulwarks and examine her foundations in the noon-day blaze of the meridian summer's sun. And challenging the scrutiny of the Greater Light, we can afford to look with calmness upon the discovery of every other, and to prize them to the full extent of their value.

If these Guilds are in themselves good and are calculated to make us and to keep us good, we ought to extend to them our sympathy and support. It is unfair and unmanly for those who believe in Guilds to charge those who are opposed to them with bigotry and Protestant prejudice. Calling hard names is an old symptom of feebleness. Let each party give credit to the opposite party for honest intentions, until we can prove the contrary. Let us reason calmly, and endeavour to weigh facts in the balance of History, Experience and Scripture.

I presume that no one would object to Guilds if their genuine tendencies resulted, by Divine aid, in grafting in the heart the love of Christ's holy name, and in aiding the culture of true religion

and virtue. If anything be in itself good, a man's soul must be miserably small that would lead him from mere party feeling to stand aloof from it.

If therefore Guilds after lying in the grave for more than three hundred years, have once more sprung into existence and religious life, I am sure that no Protestant would offer a morbid opposition to them merely because they were mediæval institutions.

Let us now proceed to deal with religious Guilds on their own merits. The scarecrow of Mediævalism need not frighten us out of the field.

At the outset I wish to admit frankly that Guilds do some good. Granted that those who are engaged in the movement are earnest and sincere. I impugn no man's motives. But at the same time I must also assert, and I shall prove my assertion, that they do much mischief. In all the Guilds there is a general movement towards obsolete and discarded ceremonies—undue and unnecessary formality in worship—an unauthorised and illegal ritual—excessive and extravagant decoration of churches, and a general adoption of Romish formularies, habits and practices necessarily calculated to do mischief—very great mischief—to the growth of spiritual religion, while it exposes the unwary and the insufficiently instructed to the temptation of becoming members of the Church of Rome. On these grounds I am opposed to the revival of Guilds in the Church of England, and I think our forefathers, who knew more about them than we do, acted wisely and well in abolishing them at the Reformation.

Guilds are as old as Paganism. What petrifications are to geology, Guilds are to religion—old curiosities which, though endowed with some interest for students who are fond of the antique, are in these days very much out of date. The attempt to revive them in the Church of England must, I think, be attributed to the increased and increasing mania among a certain section of the clergy for the pomp and circumstance of mediæval masquerade.

To understand clearly what the old Guilds were, and what they did, we must go back to the age of barbarism, with its collateral excesses in "drinking-bouts" and banquetings. With the latter features of Guilds probably some of my hearers may have been made cheerfully familiar at the hospitable board of some of our chief civic corporations. But these are the relics of the old *commercial* Guilds

—combinations of various trades which found it convenient or compulsory to unite for purposes of mutual protection.

I hope you will not think it an unprofitable employment of your time if I refer to the origin of these societies, when I tell you that the enquiry will expose the superstitious practices of these old Guilds, and the abominations committed by them under the mask and semblance of religion. If I can establish these facts we shall have a full and satisfactory reply to offer to the first question—Why the Guilds were discontinued at the Reformation?

The name of "Guild" is derived from an old Icelandic word, signifying "a feast." It is common, however, to all the Scandinavian and Teutonic languages. It is found in the Gothic and the Anglo-Saxon. The old Norse word is "Gildi." It is worthy of remark that the word occurs in the ancient translation of the New Testament into the Gothic language by Bishop Ulphilas. The passage in which the word occurs is in St. Luke xx. 22, where "the tribute-money" is referred to by our Blessed Lord. That expression is rendered into Gothic by the word "Guild." It came to signify "tribute" from the custom of every person being obliged to pay a fee for admission to the feast. We have a good illustration of the true meaning of the word in the poetic language of the Edda. In Valhalla the gods and heroes were supposed to drink "mead" at their banquets. They fought all day, and they feasted all night. This drink—mead—in the language of poetry, was called "the Guild of the Giants," that is, the cheer or feast of the giants.

The original meaning of the word then is undoubtedly a feast. And then by an easy and natural transition it gradually came to be applied to the *persons* assembled at the feast. We have a somewhat similar analogy in the word "Company." In the first instance it was used only to denote convivial entertainments among those who came—"con" together to eat "panis" bread. By and bye it was extended to any number of persons assembled for any purposes whatever.

In the olden times every freeman was obliged to attend these feasts of the brotherhood, and he was required also to bring with him his quota of food and drink for the occasion. These feasts were generally *sacrificial meals*, made up of the common contributions of the guests. Hence, after a while, a Guild came to mean not only an ordinary feast, but a *sacrificial* banquet, and later on the word was given to the members of the society or corporation. So far, then, as to the derivation of the word.

When Christianity, as represented by Popery, had spread to the North of Europe, it found the Pagan sacrifices, and the feasting usually attendant upon them, in active operation. In this instance, as in many others, Popery, like insects which take the colour of the leaf they feed on, adapted itself ingeniously to meet the prejudices of the pagans. Thus the sacrificial banquets of Paganism were amalgamated with the rites and ceremonies of what purported to be the religion of Christ. Consequently we find that those old Pagan Guilds, whose members worshipped false gods, after they became blended with Christianity, merely altered the direction of their superstition, but not its amount. The Blessed Virgin and the saints took the place of Odin and the rest of the Pagan deities. That the mediæval Guilds were of pagan origin is a matter of certainty.

One of the most reliable authorities upon this subject—Wilda—says, that “The Guilds of the mediæval ages were derived from the old Pagan Guilds.” Thus we see that the pre-Reformation Guilds were Pagan in their origin and Popish in their adaptation.

These organizations were very formidable, and at times dangerous to the Church as well as to the State. The Guild embraced so many members bound together to their chief and to each other by mutual oaths, that they could occasionally set at defiance both the temporal and the spiritual authorities.

The Emperor Charlemagne issued very stringent decrees against the Guilds. He looked with jealousy at their increasing influence, and accordingly he persecuted them everywhere he could. Judging from the severe nature of the remedies he employed to suppress them, he must have been alarmed at their growth. Any one who was discovered to be a member of a guild had his choice of several evils. He might choose scourging, or if he preferred it he might have “his nose slit,” or his ear cut off, or be banished for life. These guilds were principally confined to the laity.

The clergy also had their confraternities. We gather some strange facts with regard to the abominations which prevailed at clerical guilds—from Hincmar the Archbishop of Rheims. He vehemently denounced them on account of the wanton practices which were permitted at the feasts. But although the Archbishop condemns the abuses of the clerical guilds, he gives instructions to his clergy as to their allowed sphere of action among laymen and to the solemnities to be held at their meetings.

In Labbe's History of Councils, Vol. x. cap. 16, p. 4, we read that in the Capitulary relating to Guilds among the laity it is ordered in

general that nothing should be done that was contrary to "dignity, utility and reason." The Archbishop then proceeds to define with some precision what solemnities he considers to be proper to such occasions. "They shall unite (he says) for every exercise of religion—that is to say, they shall unite for offerings (*especially candles*), for *funeral services for the dead*, alms-deeds, &c., &c. Therefore, whether for special or for general purposes, let those who wish to offer a candle, either before Mass or during Mass, before the Gospel is read, place it (*i.e.* the candle) on the altar."

It must occur to any one who has read the periodical notices of the modern Guilds under the auspices of Ritualism that, amid much that is useful and good, these pagan superstitions are the objects of these modern organizations also. Offerings for the so-called altar, funeral rites in honour of the dead, and prayers for the dead, make up a good portion of their duties.

I cannot quote in detail the customs to which Hincmar alludes in his remarks about the Guilds of his day. They are too coarse to notice, and therefore we must pass them over. Any one sceptical on this point will find ample proof in Labbe's Councils, already quoted. From that and similar reliable sources we have accumulative evidence to prove that the licentious practices of Paganism were generally, if not always, associated with the Guilds of the middle ages. These dissolute habits—surfeittings and drunkenness—continued till the epoch of the Reformation. But, for argument's sake, omitting the more flagrant abuses of Guilds, the Archbishop of Rheims (from whom I have already quoted) makes it quite obvious what meaning he attaches to "the religious exercises" which he enjoins upon the members. He means above all things the veneration of certain religious mysteries in honour of the saints.

Everywhere the Guilds were under the patronage of the Holy Trinity—or of patron saints—or of the Holy Cross—or of the Holy Sacrament, or of some other religious mystery. In honour of the saints they placed candles on their altars and before their images, just as Roman Catholics do to this day especially on the Continent, and as the brethren of the Guilds do in England at funerals and elsewhere, as I shall presently shew you.

Allow me now to read for you a list of the titles of some of the Guilds of these days.

1. The Guild of the Holy child Jesus.
2. The Guild of St. Mary the Virgin.

3. The Guild of St. Michael the Archangel.
4. The Guild of St. Michael and all the Angola.
5. The Brotherhood of Saint Dunstan.
6. The Society of the Holy Cross.
7. The Order of Reparation to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament (whatever that means).
8. Guild of the Holy Trinity, (University of Cambridge.)
9. Brotherhood of the Holy Trinity, (University of Oxford.)
10. The Society of Apostolic Rule ; and without trespassing longer on your time in enumerating any more of the curious and quaint, but thoroughly popish terminology of these Guilds, I may mention last but not least—
11. The Guild of St. Albans.

There are, I believe, altogether about three hundred Guilds, if not more.

Let me remind you that all these confraternities exist in the Church of England. They are intended chiefly for men, although there are Guilds specially for children and women.

Whatever be the moving power of these secret societies, aggrandisement of the Church—that is, in the language of their promoters, the Clergy—is certainly one of their chief results.

Most of the Guilds are interested about the concerns of the dead as well as of the living. Of this we have clear proof. Before passing on to that part of my subject, I am anxious to give some idea how the old Guilds sometimes originated. We have a curious illustration of this from the writings of an old author* from what circumstances one of the most celebrated of the old Guilds took its rise.

Several merchants and shopmen of Flensburg were one day sitting drinking together, and having paid their score, six shillings of the current standard of the time remained over. The question arose, what should be done with this balance? After some deliberation it was finally resolved to have a *candle* made which should be allowed to burn before an image of the Virgin on the Altar of "Our Lady." From so simple and apparently so insignificant an event this brotherhood or Guild sprang into life. It increased so rapidly in

* Wilda.

summers, influence, and income, that a regular constitution with Guild-Masters, &c., &c., was adopted. The main object of this Guild appears to have been to provide candles and place them on the altars and before the image of their patron saint.

Another object of the Guilds was to have masses said in honour of their patrons, and on such occasions they went in solemn processions to their churches.

Prayers for the dead were another part of Guild operations.

In these respects the Guilds of these days agree with their ancient prototypes. A peculiar feature of Guild-work is that of adapting the Roman ritual to the use and service of Anglican Churches—For example, the office of the Tenebræ, which is one of the most distinctively Romish of all the offices in the Church of Rome. The brethren of the Guild of St. Albans have translated this office from Latin into English, and we find from the *Church Times* that on the evening of Maundy Thursday, the Guild assisted in the celebration of it in St. Michael's Church, Shoreditch. Since the days of Queen Elizabeth such a service was never celebrated in a Church of England place of worship. It is supereminently Popish.

I will now quote from a periodical called *Church Works*, in order to prove that the Guilds practise ceremonies with regard to the dead, some of which are essentially Pagan. In one of its impressions in May last, we read the following notices:—

“Brother William Henry Newman, after enduring for many months, with much patience, the daily increasing inroad of disease, fell asleep just in time to keep his first Easter with the faithful departed. *Our brother was formerly of the brotherhood of S. Peter, G.S.A., Exeter*, and most fitly was he at his own request taken to Exeter for burial. There was a celebration of the Holy Communion at Allhallows Church, where the body had rested the night previous to the burial; and all the brethren at Exeter who could possibly do so took part in the services. The bier of the B.S.P. was used, and the Bristol pall which our brother William Henry was mainly instrumental in obtaining (having himself started the fund now some years ago) was used for the first time for any one in Bristol at his own burial.”

“On the Monday in Holy Week the funeral of Probationer T. B. Hopes, of Leeds, took place at S. Barnabas in that town. After an illness of a few weeks, having *made his confession and being fortified by the Holy Eucharist*, our brother fell asleep in Jesus in Passion-week; his soul was committed to God by several members of the Brotherhood and Sisterhood according to the office in the English Catholic's *Vade Mecum*, as it passed away to paradise, the candle of the *bona mors* burning meanwhile. His body was laid out with reverent care and left to await its burial *with burning candles and the crucifix opposite his bed*. On the morning of the funeral, the Holy sacrifice of the Eucharist was offered in the church for the repose of his soul, and in the afternoon his corpse was brought into the House of

God prior to its committal to the grave. The coffin after the design of the *Instrumenta Ecclesiastica*, covered with the Guild pall, was borne into the church by members of the Brotherhood and friends, the vicar and choir meeting it at the porch with the professional cross, carried by a member of the Guild. *The candles having been lighted, the funeral office was sung*, the lesson having been read by a member of the Guild. At the conclusion of the service and during the singing of a popular Yorkshire hymn *catholicized by the vicar*, the latter left the church for the vestry and returned wearing a cope and preceded by a crucifix and candles, borne by members of the Guild, *with holy water and the thurible carried by acolytes; the aspersion and incensation then followed* during the saying of the versicles and prayers for the repose of the soul of the deceased. After that, the body was taken to the cemetery and there left to await its resurrection from the dead.

"Deaths.—Fell asleep on Easter Eve, 1872, J. H. Newman, Fellow G.S.A. of Bristol; also on March 20, J. B. Hopes, Probationer, G.S.A. of Leeds. *May they rest in peace.*"

I should like to ask where, if not from Paganism, have Ritualism and Romanism borrowed the idea of "holy water?" There is nothing of the kind in the Bible, nothing certainly in the formularies of the Church of England. We find it mentioned everywhere in Pagan literature, in the form of the "Lustral Water," used exactly as the Ritualists and Romanists use holy water. The same mode of aspersion, and for the same purposes of superstition—viz. to ward off evil spirits. Here in the work of this Guild we have mention made of "candles," "incense," "holy water," "prayers for the dead," "auricular confession," "candle of the *bona mors*," (whatever that is), "acolytes," "aspersion." This is Paganism all over. Just conceive the scene enacted in the chamber of the dying man, whose deathbed history is thus dragged forth into open day, with all the adjuncts of a garish and sensational ritual. First we have the fact that he was a "Probationer," then that he was taken ill, and after a few weeks he died. Now let us follow him through all that sad period. First the priest comes to receive the dying man's confession—then he is absolved—then fortified by the holy Eucharist—then while his soul was passing away, we are told that it was committed to God by several members of the Guild, according to the office in the English Catholic *Vade Mecum*. While this solemn scene was being enacted, "the candle of the *bona mors*," as it is called, was burning in the sick room—then we have the ceremonial of "the laying out of the body with reverent care"—then the lonely chamber (in which is the silent occupant) lit up with candles, while a crucifix is suspended opposite the face of the dead—then a symbolic coffin made after a peculiar design, and surmounted with the Guild pall, is borne with a procession into the church, where there are more lighted candles, and singing, and incensing, and

sprinkling with holy water. I must not omit to mention also that "the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist," was offered in the church on the morning of the funeral, for the repose of the dead man's soul. It is a relief at last to read that the poor body was permitted to be at rest in the quiet tomb, to await its resurrection.

Now these duties here described were performed by the Guild. Thus we may gather from this what sort of things modern guilds are and what the occupations in which they are engaged.

The Reformation shook the whole system of Guilds to their very foundation. And after such facts as I have stated can we wonder at it? If then I were called upon to answer the question why these organizations were discontinued I could have no hesitation in replying,—because they were founded in superstition, maintained by ignorance, and calculated not only to demoralize the people, but to bring religion into contempt.

I shall very briefly for the few minutes at my disposal answer the other question—Is spiritual religion promoted by Guilds? That I have partly answered by shewing what the practices of the Guilds are, and as such wholly opposed to the spiritual teaching of the Gospel.

What is meant by spiritual religion? One thing is very evident, that mere devotion—indeed any amount of devotion—does not constitute religion. A man may be very devout all his life, and at the same time without one particle of spiritual religion. St. Paul is an example of this. His Pharisaic ritual, and it was honestly and fervently celebrated, brought no spiritual life to his soul. With regard to these Guilds, the fact which has impressed itself on my own mind is, that while they seem to stir up the feelings and do actually produce in the conversation and the conduct of those who are members of them a considerable amount of *devotion*, they yet fail to promote the growth of spiritual religion. I ask then, what is spiritual religion? It is the life of God in the soul of man, and it is carried on there only by the power of the Holy Spirit. Can this be done by the magic of holy water? or by the supposed virtues resident in holy candles? Can incantations muttered over the lifeless clay affect the spirit in that mysterious but invisible world into which it has been summoned? Surely not. It is not possible that such heathen ceremonies can alter the current of the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, much less affect the spiritual condition of the departed soul. The dead in Christ require no human aids to add

to their blessedness, and the dead out of Christ are beyond the power of mortal succour.

There is a shallow notion, and it is to be feared somewhat popular, that a devout man must necessarily be a spiritually-minded man. The man who disbelieves the Gospel may be a very moral man, and do a great deal of good, and even preach much of the truth of the Bible, and yet be an utter stranger to vital godliness. He may never have once called upon God—the true God. Devotion is one thing, religion is quite another thing.

This is an important distinction. Inattention to this truth causes much of the confusion which exists with regard to spiritual life. A man may spend all his days in the performance of the most painful penances, bodily mortifications, and austerities, and yet know nothing of the principle of true religion.

When St. Paul beheld the devotions of the men of Athens, he saw an altar bearing an inscription—"To the unknown God," and in referring to this fact he observes, "whom being ignorant of ye are devout." There can be no doubt that this is the proper rendering of the words, which our English version has translated by "whom ye ignorantly worship." Every Greek scholar is aware that the word *ὃν* depends not on *εὔσεβεῖτε* but *ἀγνοοῦντες*. To give the words a free translation, they would run thus, "whom ye in the midst of your devotions know not."

I may here observe that this is one of the very few passages involving a practical principle which admits of correction. No Greek author extant supplies an instance of the verb *εὔσεβειν* governing an accusative case. Every Greek scholar knows that *εὔσεβεῖν* is a word which does not include in its signification the good or the bad character of the devotion to which it is applied. Moreover it never admits of the construction *εὔσεβεῖν θεόν* as a verb transitive; so that *ὃν* certainly depends on *ἀγνοοῦντες*, and not upon *εὔσεβεῖτε*. The expression in 1 Tim. v. 4, which some might think a solitary exception, will not bear the interpretation given in the Acts. Besides able critics have suggested that the proper reading should be *πρὸς τὸν*, and not *πρῶτον*.

The monk, the hermit, the nun, the Indian devotee, the priests of Baal, the worshippers of Moloch, the Romish flagellants, and the host of other fanatics, ancient and modern, have imagined that pain, and torture, and isolation from the sympathy of nature and of society around them, have a meritorious efficacy and are acceptable to the Almighty.

Isaiah depicts with graphic power and pungent satire how utterly useless all such sacrifices are. God strictly condemns them. The Lord Jesus proclaims, in language intelligible to every one that it is *not the position but the dis-position of the worshipper* that is pleasing to God.

There is no one place now more holy than another—no one man who as priest can come between the sinner and the Saviour.

“God is a Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.”

Imagine, then, such a symbolic service as the Tenebræ—or such funeral rites and ceremonies as I have already named—or the celebration of high mass, with all its pomp and splendour—the gorgeous vestments of the priests, the incense, the lighted candles, etc.—and then ask whether such a complicated and imposing ritual suggests the simplicity and naturalness of the early Christian worshipper, or, the sacrificial system of Pagan idolatry?

To conclude—Guilds, as the historian Madox tells us, were abolished at the Reformation “because of their inherent superstition.” They were first introduced by the Pagans, and Popery borrowed them. The Reformation swept them out of the Church; and now, after lying quiescent for more than three hundred years, they are galvanised into existence. I will leave you to judge whether Guilds were rightly or wrongly discarded, and whether, as they are now carried on, they tend to deepen spiritual life or to destroy it?

I cannot close my remarks without quoting a passage from the able and faithful charge of Archdeacon Garbett. “*In solemn earnest (he says) dare we reasonably expect the continuance of God’s protection if having been raised up as the world’s witness to Gospel truth, and the primitive faith, we are content to cherish in our bosom the Sacerdotalism of Rome, and the IDOLATRY OF THE MASS.*”

THE BEST MEANS FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SPIRITUAL AND EVANGELICAL RELIGION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. TALBOT GREAVES,
RECTOR OF MELCOMBE REGIS, WEYMOUTH.

To begin with, we are powerless in this matter, and shall not advance a step till we feel and acknowledge it. Spiritual and Evangelical Religion is the work of God's Spirit on man's spirit by the Gospel. "Salvation is of the Lord." Waves of spiritual life ebb and flow. We cannot command the Spirit and yet we can do nothing without Him. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." God will have our Church know before he blesses her that the blessing is altogether from Himself. "Not by power nor by might, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Now Gideon's fleece is wet with the dew while the floor on which it lies is dry, and now damp is the stone and dry is the fleece, for the Spirit is free and sovereign in His visitations. A humble Church will be a blessed Church. Let our wants and woes drive us to our knees. There is such a thing as not coming low enough to be blessed. Hence, too, prayer for the Spirit's out-pouring must underlie all our efforts: in our own utter helplessness we must grasp the Almighty hand; "let him lay hold of My strength," must have for its response "I will not let thee go except thou bless me." But what practical steps can we take to advance Spiritual and Evangelical Religion in our Church? We are all agreed that it is needed. Whether a little more or a little less,—whether advancing, or stationary, or retrograding—it is certainly far too small to satisfy those who would see our Jerusalem a praise in the earth. No doubt the tide of Evangelical Religion has risen many feet and carried the vessel much forward since this century begun, but instead of still rising it seems now to pause or even ebb, and the vessel is left stranded. Oh! for a mighty flood of spiritual influence that would bear our stranded Church right out into a sea of usefulness! And how can we hope to obtain it? The question would be more difficult had we not the light of the past to guide us. We can look back and trace out the rapid rise of Spiritual and Evangelical Religion in our Church:—it was the work of a few, who could count upon their fingers the names of those who were preaching Christ in their day. What was the secret of their success? if we can ascertain it, we may try it again and hope for like results.

I.—It seems to me that their success lay very much in their real felt, marked separation from the world, in its amusements, associations, and forms of religion. They "went forth unto Jesus without the camp, bearing his reproach" more than we do. Once the Evangelical body despised the world and contemned alike its pleasures and its frowns; but now are not the chains of worldly fashion upon us? is not our spiritual life eaten up with questionable amusements and conformities? The line of separation is scarcely visible, and the professed people of God are so mixed up with the sons of men that you cannot discern the one from the other. And do not worldly men infer that our religion is only a fiction? We are tolerated

at the expense of being despised, and we leave no solemn impression of God behind us. Men applaud the fleshly mortifications and labours of Ritualists and Romanists because we fail to show them the true spirit of self-denial. If we would put forth real power, we need to look to ourselves in this matter : Am I slothful and wasteful of time ? Am I worldly, associating myself with men who cannot, by any possibility, profit me ? Am I seen where my Master would not be welcome ? Do I love amusements which can afford me no comfort to reflect on, and which I should never indulge in if I thought that Christ would come while I was in them ? Am I as showy, as volatile, as frivolous as men and women of the world ? and then, are we covetous ? has the love of money taken the place of the love of Christ ? is our first thought not how we may honour God, but how we may accumulate wealth ? Let us be careful how we enter the world, for gain or pleasure, under pretence of being missionaries. There cannot be a more unpromising place than worldly society for a man who has a spark of religion in him to enter, if he wishes to keep it still burning. If it were very warm and bright he would not venture there ; but those who have least religion to lose are most ready to thrust it into danger. When Christian parents have families springing up, daughters to be married off, and sons to be started in life, the temptation to worldly conformity is strong, it fills one at times with a kind of despair to see how those who profess to regard spiritual religion as all important, subordinate it to almost everything in life ; how educational accomplishments and choice of pursuits and friendships and alliances are discussed and fixed without this once entering into serious consideration.—This is one great reason why Spiritual and Evangelical Religion makes so little progress, and why Christian families are constantly melting away into the worldliness around them—simpler habits, more self-denial, visible separation from the world, would do much to restore to the Evangelical body their olden power in the land.

II.—Again it seems, to me, that their success lay very much in their all-consuming zeal, their all-subduing travail for souls—Read the sermons of Wesley and Whitfield, and what is there in them ? Perhaps they seem scarcely worthy to have survived, and yet those sermons wrought marvels ? And why ? Because these men were soul-seekers and soul-winners ; their inmost self was love to souls and they threw themselves into their sermons—it was the tearful eye, and glowing countenance, the pleading tone, the bursting heart—these things could not be printed, and these are what we want if Evangelical religion is to advance—God does not give conversions to eloquence but to heart ; truth *from* the heart goes *to* the heart. This is God's battle-axe and weapon of war. He is pleased to use the yearnings, longings, and sympathies of Christian men far more than polished sentences or even orthodox statements. God send us men who will weep their eyes out over sinners, who will agonize with God for conversions ; and then it is not Ritualism or Rationalism either that shall withstand us.

Those who do a work for Christ are those who suffer "great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart" for sinners. How would a dozen or two of importunate pleaders and lovers of souls shake this land from end to end ! but "iniquity abounds and the love of the many waxes cold." There was a time perhaps when you would have done anything to bring a man to Christ, but you are not so ready to speak for Jesus now as you once were. Does the tear tremble in your eye now, as it once did for lost souls, perishing, without Christ ? Alas ! upon how many of us has a freezing influence operated. And this is true of us Ministers. We have grown professional in our services, and, for the most part, we preach like automats, which are wound up for a sermon, to run down when the discourse is over. Trifles

of criticism, fancies of speculation, or flowers of oratory fascinate too many who should be wise to win souls.

We want more intense earnestness; not of excited natural feeling, but of God's indwelling Spirit. The Church is spiritually "a barren woman" without it, whilst with it, she becomes "a joyful mother of children." "As soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children."

III.—But once more looking back to those giants of other days, who wrought such wonders in our Church, we may see a great secret of their success in their more simple and entire confidence in the Gospel. *They* had a Creed. They could say, "I believe and therefore speak," and if we are to advance Spiritual and Evangelical religion, we must not be men who believe nothing, or anything, or everything by turns; we must hold God's truth with an iron grasp. There is a Protestantism still worth contending for, there are distinctive doctrines of Grace still worth proclaiming, and a Gospel worth dying for. There is such a thing as Spiritual Evangelical religion, as distinguished from Ritualism, or Rationalism, or Legalism, and let us make it known that we believe in it. These are not days to be frightened at cries of sectarianism and bigotry: if we would prevail, we must believe in our hearts what we profess to believe, and proclaim openly and zealously what we know to be the truth. Let us not be ashamed to say this is truth, and let men draw the inference that the opposite is falsehood. Let us display our banner, and let it be that which the Church carried of old; unfurl the old primitive standard, the all-victorious standard of the cross of Christ. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." As I read the lives of those good soldiers of Christ who won the early victories of the Gospel in our Church, nothing so strikes me as their greater confidence in the atonement as the great conquering truth which was "to subdue the people under them." We cannot place too much reliance on the simple Gospel; our weakness is that we are so diffident, and so apt to look elsewhere for strength. Too often we preach the Gospel as if we were afraid. What! are we God's messengers, and shall we crouch to the sons of men to ask them what message they would like best? Because men of the world despise the Gospel, and philosophers, "falsely so called," tell us that science has overthrown it, and because Ritualism is popular we need to be all the more resolute, and to say to men, though it be platitude to you, and you declare it to be contemptible, you shall have it or nothing else from us, for "it is the power of God and the wisdom of God." Let us still continue, God helping us, preaching "the foolishness of the Gospel," and deliver again and again the old truth that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," that "by grace are ye saved through faith and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Salvation is by free favour through the expiatory sacrifice of Jesus our Lord. The very plague and bane of the Evangelical body in our Church is going down to Egypt for help. Instead of simply meeting all the attractions and solicitations of Ritualism with a fuller, freer, bolder preaching of the Gospel, there has been a too general attempt to take more than one leaf out of the Ritualists' book, to keep pace with them, and copy everything that seems innocent in their system. More music, more ornate services, more church decorations, shorter sermons, and altogether a far larger number of small imitations than we are well aware of.

There has been a leaning on these things, instead of a simple and firm reliance on that great Spiritual power which we have and they have not. How foolish as well as faithless is this! The bird that wished to outstrip us would not attempt

to run by our side, but would use its own swift wings. We have the strong wings of a great eagle, and shall we instead of mounting up with them run a weary foot race with these men who have none? We may court and foster a taste for these ornate and gothic services, but remember we can never successfully compete with Ritualists in ministering to the taste.

I fear that an entire acceptance of the Gospel, a real knowledge of it, a sure confidence in it, is more rare than we think. "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but they are mighty." Evangelical religion is perfectly spiritual, it thrusts nothing between the sinner and his Saviour, and that received into our own hearts and put before others will tell, we do not want anything besides the Gospel. This is the remedy we believe in, let others choose sweet music or pictures, or vestments or human rites—as for us it is to the preaching of Christ crucified that we look for the saving of souls and of our Church too. There is a great rage for Conferences and all sorts of plans and new expedients are discussed, I see no need of any new instrument: is not the preached Gospel enough? all we need now is more Spiritual influence accompanying it. The preaching which moves one heart to-day needs not to be altered to tell upon a thousand to-morrow. With God's Spirit our present instrumentalities will suffice to win the world for Christ, without Him ten thousand times as much apparent force would be only so much weakness. Therefore, I would say to advance Spiritual and Evangelical Religion in the Church of England, "Preach the word; be instant in season and out of season; for the time will come when men will not endure sound doctrine." Oh! let us use no other harp and let our fingers never leave its strings;—the harp whose strings vibrate to the name of Jesus only, and let us not fear that it will not be sweetest music in men's ears; spiritual life will awaken at the sound, and spiritual life can never be bound down by chains of formalism. The seed whose hidden life begins to stir within soon bursts and throws aside its dark, hard, dead case which can contain it no more. When the butterfly has once spread its soft wings to the air and the sunshine, no power of man can ever enclose them in the chrysalis again.—And those who are called forth into the glorious liberty of the children of God will not become sacramentarians or formalists.

One word more. There are some who seem to think that Spiritual and Evangelical Religion can best be advanced within the Church of England by withdrawing from her in a solemn protest against error. I cannot see it so. Should we not rather imitate our Lord. He taught in the temple and He cleansed it. That temple was as corrupt as ever our Church can be, and His foreseeing eye saw how vain would all attempts at reformation prove, yet He taught in it and cleansed it, not once but twice.

We cannot see the future. Our efforts may yet be crowned with success. At any rate, let us teach in the temple and let us cleanse it:—the result may be with us as it was with our Master, we may be cast out of the temple, and then the Lord will give it to others; but let us not court defeat by anticipating it. And let it not be said of us that being armed with the Gospel of Christ and "carrying the bow of the Spirit," we turned back in the day of battle.

RITUALISM AND RITUALISM.

WHY SOME OUGHT TO BE SUPPORTED, AND SOME
CONDEMNED.

A REPLY TO THE REV. DR. LITLEDALE.

BY THE REV. JOHN RICHARDSON, M.A.,

Vicar of St. Mary's, Bury St. Edmunds.

A. I.—“Ritualism means the solemn, beautiful, and reverent performance of religious rites.”* If this means “all ritualism,” it is not a correct explanation. Much performance of religious rites is neither solemn, beautiful, nor reverent. If it means “some ritualism,” it is a truism which leaves the controverted point untouched. If it means “my ritualism”—that of my school or practice—it begs the question. The ritualism of our Prayer-book and our Reformed Church we support; but modern ritualism—fancy ritualism—unauthorized ritualism, we condemn. There is nothing in creation like a man prostrate before a wafer, under which he believes the incarnate God to be. There is nothing in the human mind or heart which justifies the assumption that in public worship of Almighty God, what some men recommend or arrange for the multitude to offer as their best, is therefore the best to offer. Things that shock, and wound, and startle, and perplex some, are not to be thrust by private men into public service. Mental religion rejects this as a monstrous thing. And revealed religion, God’s will expressed in the Old Testament and in the New, when intelligently examined and reverently obeyed, will lead us to the right and the wise and the

* The quotations in this paper are from Dr. Littledale’s Tract, “What is Ritualism?”

true, as ever Paul was guided, when "the priest of Jupiter, which was before their city, brought oxen and garlands unto the gates, and would have done sacrifice with the people." Acts xiv. 13. That was ritualism; but it was not solemn, nor beautiful, or reverent. Natural religion, mental religion, revealed religion, did not sanction that.

II., III., IV.—"The solemn ritual kind of service which God revealed to Moses in the Old Testament cannot be contradicted by the New Testament, unless God has changed." "Our Lord, when He was on earth, frequented the Temple worship, and so did the Apostles even after the Day of Pentecost." "If God chose to be served formerly with a costly, ornate, and ceremonial worship, He cannot mean to be served now in a bare, cold, and careless manner." These three arguments may be taken together as growing out of the one matter of the old Mosaic service. The fallacies in them are these. The New Testament has supplemented, but it has not *contradicted*, the Old. The substance has come and the shadow ceases; and Paul's great principle applies with all its force, "Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Show us any ordinances which is a shadow for which no substance is to be found in Christ, and we continue the shadow till the substance comes. The Sabbath is an instance in point. "There remaineth, therefore, a rest (keeping of a Sabbath; marg. read.) to the people of God," and till that real rest is reached, God's people maintain the Sabbath ordinance which points to Heaven.

The Lord Jesus never entered the Jewish temple after His own sacrifice upon the cross had been completed. The old service could not continue, because "the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom." Matt. xxvii. 51. Jesus after His accession was not priest, but High-priest, in the temple worship. The Apostle Paul has explained the whole matter thus. "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come, an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, He entered in once

into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. ix. 10—12. St. Paul cannot stop as Dr. Littledale would, who says "certain parts of it were now at an end, such as animal sacrifices, &c.;" but he puts meats, drinks, divers washings, and carnal ordinances as the things changed. The old service was far more than "a prayer that Christ might come;" it was a promise that He would come. And the new service is far more than "a thanksgiving that Christ has come." It is a pleading before God that Christ has come; and, a showing before men that we are waiting, watching, working, worshipping, till Christ shall come again. Modern ritualism is a going back from High-priest to priest, from substance to shadow, from spirit to letter, from Gospel to law, from "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all;" (Heb. x. 10) to "offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin." The "bare, cold, and careless manner," is not the necessary, not our accepted alternative, when we declare that "a costly, ornate, and ceremonial worship," such as we find in a modern ritualistic church, is what we must condemn, as retrograde, uncalled for, unsanctioned in our Reformed Church.

V.—"He has told us how His angels, who are spirits, and His departed saints who have put off the burden of the flesh, worship Him in Heaven. There is an altar before the Throne, there are bowings and prostrations, there are white robes, there is choral service, there are processions, and there is incense. If we reject these things from our earthly worship, much more if we mock and revile them, we are not doing God's "will on earth as it is in heaven."

This is an old argument which one is surprised to meet with at this day of the ritualistic controversy. It belongs to the infantile days of the discussion, when the real strain of the struggle had not been reached. The Lord's Prayer argument must drop out of sight ere long. There are far more things in the heavenly worship than the preceding quotation has brought out. The earthly imitation must be abandoned or made complete. Thus the white robes are on all the worshippers above (Rev. vii. 9). Why are they confined to the clergy and their choir men below? If we are to have the "golden vials full of odours," why are we

not to have the harps with which they are so closely connected? (Rev. v. 8). If the white robes are of so significant importance, to ministering worshippers at all events, why have not our clergy "on their heads crowns of gold?" (Rev. iv. 4). If there are to be the processions, why not the palms? (Rev. vii. 9). The "golden altar" which was before the throne" (Rev. viii. 3) was one at which an angel ministered and not a man; and we are not angels but men. But as men, intelligent, responsible, reflective creatures, we are not to be drawn away from the sober, scriptural, suitable worship which our Church provides, for a ritualism which comes to us with far-fetched, and fanciful, and halting arguments and interpretations such as these.

VI.—"What would He have said of the rich men, if they had cast just the same sum as she" (the widow) "did into the treasury? And yet that is what men do who give Him an unadorned service, where they have ample means at their disposal to do better." No; it is not thus. The man may offer a service which Dr. Littledale may call unadorned, and yet not offer it out of a penurious spirit. He may believe that the adorning "is of the hidden man of the heart, whose praise is not of men, but of God." He may have proved by precedent and by fact, that gorgeous ceremonials have been more the ornaments of a dead than the natural beauty of a living worship. He may understand how the senses, as they attach to the material accompaniments, are wont to keep down the heart from rising to the spiritual realities and enjoyments in God's presence. The man who spends less upon externals in the hour of prayer, may yet be, and often has been, a man who is nobly generous in spreading the Gospel of the grace of God unto every nation under heaven. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?" There may be selfishness in a man who provides the music, and the painting, and the processions, which suit his taste; and there may be a true self-denial in another man, who gives, as God has prospered him, for the benefit of men he never will see, for the maintenance of what he thinks a pure service in which he never may personally take a part, for the advancement not of a party but of the real Church of Christ. The "*wise men* who bring the gold and frankincense, and myrrh," are not all within the limits of any section of the community in any age or place.

VII.—There is a position taken in this seventh section which has a graver aspect than any we have yet reached. "Religion is a beautiful and happy thing, not sour and repulsive." Granted. "God ought to be worshipped on earth as He is in heaven." This is only half a truth, seeing that men in the flesh and men out of the flesh, cannot in every particular worship God alike. "God ought to be publicly worshipped every day, and not on Sundays only." An exaggeration of the "ought," for what becomes of the sick, of the solitary, if this is rigidly to be enforced? "A poor man has as good a right as a rich one to a place in church." Admitted. "The Bible ought to be read—publicly read—twice every day, instead of being shut during the week." The Bible ought to be read every day; that is a matter of Christian duty and privilege. It may be well read publicly every day; but that is the "ought" of a church arrangement, and not the "ought" of a Divine command. "We ought not to lavish all sorts of luxuries on our private houses, and all sorts of ritual and ceremonies on our dinners and parties, and yet allow God's house to be bare, and His service free and easy." Much truth, and some uncertainty here. But what of the real pith and poison of this seventh paragraph, "The Atonement still goes on and is not over." The Atonement not over! "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all." "This man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting" what?—that the atonement was to go on still? No; "from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool. For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Between my soul and my God, there must be no mediator but the Man Christ Jesus. And in the matter of atonement for my sin, there is to be no addition, no repetition, but only the finished work, and the full satisfaction of the Lord Jesus Christ. The advocacy of Jesus goes on; but not His atonement. "He ever liveth to make intercession;" but "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." "Now once in the end of the world hath He appeared, to put away sin, by the sacrifice of Himself." If then any ritualism, however beautiful and captivating and thrilling it may be made, shall in any way darken the glorious truth, or thrust it into the background, that "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world,

both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone" (Article XXXI.) it becomes a very serious question of doctrinal importance; and out of very love for Christ, for truth, and for souls, we must condemn, expose, and resist this evil thing which threatens to damage and disgrace our Church.

The second branch of Dr. Littledale's subject need not be followed out into its more minute details. The superstructure falls by its own weight, when the buttresses of unsound construction have been taken down. Thus we may safely argue

B.—Ritualism, if it have no more to say for its defence ought not only not to be supported, but ought to be condemned.

I.—Because, if it had been required for the Church's worship, we should have found some trace of it in the inspired record of the early history of the Church. But the Book of the Acts has given us no idea of it. The Pastoral Epistles, in which an apostle is entering directly, and of set purpose, on the very subjects of the ministry which involve the very points of service, have no hint or direction about anything of a kind like what is now sought to be introduced.

II.—Because the matter of ritual is in the hands, not of the individual minister, and not of any particular body of worshippers; but of the aggregate Church to which the ritual is to be applied. "The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies" (Article XX.). "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly alike; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed, according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly." (Article XXXIV.) "The law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christian men." (Article VII.) Therefore, as a sound Churchman, respecting rightful authority and ecclesiastical

discipline, a man who resists novelties in public worship is on the side of right and wisdom.

III.—Because the Reformed Church of England has of set purpose, and with deliberate and determined act, put away the rites and ceremonies which some men now seek to bring back. The documents and formularies of the Church have been purged of the old ritualistic phrases. The practice and public administrations of the church have put aside the old ritualistic vestments, postures, acts, and injunctions. The Courts and judgments of the Church have given in decision after decision against the modern introduction of things which savour of the ritualistic spirit, and subserve the ritualistic campaign. Therefore, as a loyal maintainer of the system which I am under solemn engagements to defend, as a true son of an Evangelical and Protestant Church, out of which have been intentionally cast the things which in former ages were found to work not for good, but harm, I am bound to enter my protest, and lift up my hand and voice against a system which is alien to the spirit and the letter of the Church in which I serve.

It is because I am an Englishman, jealous for my country's honour—because I am a Churchman, anxious for my Church's credit—because I am a Christian, concerned about everything which interferes with my Master's work, worship, and welcome amongst sinners—that I call upon all the true men amongst us in this State and Church of England, to stand apart from the new doctrines, new ritual, and new party, from which mischief has come, and is yet coming upon much that we value and love.

No. XXI.]

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN,

AND

THEIR ROMANIZING TEACHING.

BY THE

REV. JAMES ORMISTON,

VICAR OF OLD HILL, NEAR DUDLEY.

PRICE ONE PENNY, OR 6s PER 100.

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN, AND THEIR ROMANIZING TEACHING.

BY THE REV. JAMES ORMISTON, VICAR OF OLD HILL, NEAR DUDLEY.

THE influence of hymnology in promoting the diffusion of Divine truth has ever been recognized by the Church of God. Sacred song, from the very foundation of Christianity, formed a prominent feature in the conduct of public worship. Thus, Pliny the younger, whose testimony comes not more than seventy years after the death of Christ, has left on record that certain persons, associated with the worship of the persecuted followers of the Crucified One, reported that "they were wont to meet together, on a stated day, before it was light, and sang among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ, as a god." The adoption of song as promoting the cause of error is not, therefore, matter for surprise. Indeed, we should naturally expect that those aiming at the diffusion of peculiar and novel doctrines would, in order to provoke as little hostility as possible, employ any agency which the promoters of Divine truth had for ages continued to use. Moreover, in poetry and music,—agencies which, unsanctified by God's grace, powerfully appeal to the human passions,—the apostles of a system of sensuous religion find to hand two most popular and attractive modes of presenting their teaching. What, it may be asked, is more influential on the minds of most people than a well-harmonized melody? It matters very little to too many who attend our churches what the words are if "the tune is good." Consequently, the astute innovators of Romish error have seized on this weakness of human nature, and address their appeals to the feelings, not to the judgment, of their followers, knowing that if only they can captivate the emotions they have practically taken the citadel. Who has not heard a large congregation of educated, thoughtful, intelligent people, joining with apparent sincerity and earnestness in singing words of most doubtful orthodoxy, simply because the tune held the mastery over their feelings? Now, what is this but sacrificing truth on the altar of sensuousness? This mode of getting the congregations of our churches accustomed to Romish phraseology, and worse, to Romish doctrines, has of late years been the most successful of all the various

efforts put forth by the Ritualists to educate the people of England in Popery, and to pervert the Protestant faith. And it is not a question admitting of a doubt that of all the many hymnals which have issued from the press of the Anglo-Roman propaganda none can compete either for subtlety or success with the volume known as *HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN*.* The fact that it boasts of a circulation of 8,000,000 copies sufficiently attests the success of the work. The general commendations which it receives, even in the families of thousands among us whose sympathies are rather with "the noble army of martyrs" and the faith for which they laid down their lives, than with the fallen Church of Rome, only too clearly demonstrate the subtlety of the compilation. So skilful an admixture of Gospel, sentimental, and Romish, hymns may well betray the unsuspecting and the uninformed. The wisdom of the compilers in giving only a certain proportion of Romanism, and not always Romanism pure and simple, is too obvious to need a remark. The faithful Bishop of Huron lately observed in his primary address to the Synod of his diocese, when lifting up his voice in protest against the use of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* in "churches or families," that, "If all the hymns were unsound, they would at once have been detected, and very few would have been deceived. It was, therefore, a skilful masterpiece of our Anglican Romanizers to administer the poison in small doses, not to be perceived immediately, but to effect nevertheless eventually their purpose, of undermining the Spiritual Constitution of our Reformed Church." Then, another, and an all-important feature in the scheme was to set the words to attractive music. And, lest any acquainted with the objectionable character of the words should yet wish to use the music, it is so arranged that in purchasing the tunes they *must* purchase the words also. The words are printed without the music, but not the music without the words. That the publication is intended as a *progressive scheme* for Romanizing the congregations of our land is shown by the *periodical* issue of its parts. First came out, in 1861, the 273 hymns bearing the title "*Hymns Ancient and Modern, for use in the Services of the Church*." Of that number 118 were taken from Roman Catholic Breviaries, Missals, and other

* It is often urged by those who defend this pernicious hymnal that its origin and tendency are beyond suspicion. In reply to this apology, the following proofs are adduced that the Romanizing party in our Church distinctly claim the work as their own. The Rev. Dr. Littledale, in his article "Church Parties" in the *Contemporary Review* (July, 1874), observes:—"Hymns Ancient and Modern, a HIGH CHURCH BOOK which appeared in 1861, although denounced then and ever since on doctrinal grounds by the Evangelical school, has driven out Kemble, Mercer, Bickersteth, &c. in hundreds of churches, and has circulated between seven and eight millions of copies." The *Church Times*, too, in an article on the "Church Association" (Nov. 3, 1876), in the course of which the Editor refers to the spread of Ritualistic doctrines, and pointedly quotes this very hymnal as propagating them, says:—"And there is *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, hotly opposed by the extreme Puritans, and driven out of every church where they are masters. It contains MUCH OF THE TEACHING they are always denouncing, and we are speaking within bounds when we say that its circulation is at least eight millions of copies." One member of the notorious "*Society of the Holy Cross*" alone contributes seven hymns to this Romanizing selection.

Popish sources, many of them being standard hymns at present used in the Romish Church. After the first instalment had become largely adopted, though often only through the most insidious and persevering efforts of the party, an *Appendix* containing 113 hymns was put forth. A comparison of the two parts shows unmistakably that Romish development is the principle upon which the compilers have proceeded. Then came out a third part, entitled "*Introits and Anthems for the Services of the Church.*" And recently an entirely new edition of the book has appeared, containing 473 hymns, of which 143 are taken from Latin sources, and to 37 of which the names of *Popish priests* are appended in the guinea edition. Doubtless, if the present book be allowed to hold in the Church the pre-eminence it has already attained, and continue to be used without check by authority in our cathedrals, churches, and chapels, our Army and Navy, and in our families and our schools, the Ritualistic party may well look forward to completing their plans for a final re-union of our Reformed Church with the great Apostasy of Rome. For, the general and allowed adoption of this hymnal is tantamount to an authoritative acceptance of many of Rome's worst errors. At a time when the question of uniformity in our hymnals is being agitated it becomes, therefore, of the utmost importance that the real character of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* should be made so clear as to place it outside the bounds of possibility that choice should fall in the direction of the adoption, either in part or in whole, of that selection.

Without attempting to do more than call attention to some of the grosser features of the hymnal, from a doctrinal point of view, the following charges are laid before the reader, with corresponding proofs from the pages of the hymnal. The volume entitled "*HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN*" teaches:—

I. MARIOLATRY.

II. IDOLATRY; or, The Worship of Material Things.

III. TRANSUBSTANTIATION, and THE REAL PRESENCE.

IV. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION, *ex opere operato*.

V. PRAYER FOR THE DEAD.

VI. SALVATION BY HUMAN WORKS.

Besides these positive marks of Romanism there are innumerable Romish terms and phrases; for instance, "dread keys," "great sacrament," "Mary undefiled," "the mother maid," "octave," "introits," "altar," "refection," "angel guard," "penitential tears," "tersanctus," "confessor," &c. (See *Thoughts on Hymns Ancient and Modern*, by the Rev. H. McSorley, M.A.) The tone of the book, as a whole, is decidedly Popish. The following direct proofs of Romish teaching may suffice to convince the reader that it contains deadly error, couched in the most subtle language.

1. MARY-WORSHIP.

ANY one at all conversant with the history of the great Apostasy must be aware that the *cultus* of the Virgin has become, after the steady growth of ages, one of the most prominent features of the fallen

Church of Rome. "The mystery of iniquity" was energetic in the germ, as St. Paul affirms, even in Apostolic times. But as the earlier centuries of the post-apostolic era declined the germ began to vegetate more demonstrably. Councils gathered into permanent form the floating errors of previous ages, gave forth in tones of decretive authority, and in terms wholly foreign to the language of inspired Scripture, propositions, definitions, and expositions, which in course of time came to be accepted as binding upon the conscience and faith of Christians, unless indeed they chose boldly to stand upon the *exclusiveness* of the written Word of God in all matters of faith, and to take the consequences. Thus, to illustrate by one of the earliest conciliar departures from the simple testimony of Holy Scripture, we have the invention of that most fruitfully false term *Θεοτόκος* as applied to the espoused wife of Joseph.* The authoritative use of the term "Mother of God" by Councils of the fifth century laid the foundation of that idolatrous and revolting Mary-worship which to-day is being offered by Roman Catholics and Ritualists to the great dishonour of the Incarnate God and of the blessed instrument of His Incarnation. Gradually from that germ-title "Mother of God" has the arch-enemy of the Kingdom of the God-MAN developed the present system of Mariolatry. To the Church of Rome and her sympathisers has been left the distinctive sin of formulating the consequences that flow from that unscriptural word—*Θεοτόκος*.† What though the erring Greek Church embody the expression in its liturgies? Rome has ever proudly claimed to be the conservator of the glories of Mary, and to Rome does the trust rightfully belong. Never once in the New Testament is "the Mother of Jesus" held forth as being *the Mother of DEITY*, or is even alluded to as being anything else than the favoured instrument of bringing into this fallen world the "flesh" or "manhood,"‡ which, according to the councils of Jehovah the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,

* The fallacy and heresy of *Θεοτόκος* are to be found in confusing the two infinitely dissimilar propositions—*MARY WAS THE MOTHER OF HIM WHO IS GOD*—and, *MARY WAS THE MOTHER OF GOD*.

† In an essay published by the Rev. O. Shipley "On the Cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary" (Longmans, 4th edit., p. 62), the writer approvingly remarks:—"In like manner the Council of Ephesus, when it gave to our Lady the title of *Theotokos*, produced a seed from which subsequent doctrines were the legitimate growth." The same writer concludes his essay with these noteworthy words:—"Why do they of the Roman Obedience exaggerate the faults of their brethren of the Anglican Communion? Why are Anglicans so bitter against Romans? 'Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?' We may *hope* that, as the mists of error disperse, and the light of Divine Truth shines more clearly upon the Church, Anglicans will see the *necessity*, as well as the *propriety*, of the Cultus of our Lady. The doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son is incomplete without there be held with it the *fact* of the sinless life of His Mother. Can the worship of the Incarnate Son be perfect without the *CULTUS* of His *SINLESS MOTHER*? It is the 'missing link,' that has so long severed the Anglican from communion with both East and West. To join again the broken chain will surely bring that blessing which the Son of Mary once pronounced—'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.'" What impartial reader can now doubt that the germ of Mary-worship is found in a love of this false *Motherhood of Mary*?

‡ See *Athanasian Creed*.

Christ took "into God." Where is Mary called the "Mother of God"—where, but in the pages of human tradition? A doctrine so monstrously absurd as that the creature is superior to the Creator has no place in the pages of Divine truth. Yet, the Romish theory now adopted by the Ritualists, is, that God was born of Mary.

That the worship of the Virgin is, by means of this popular hymnal, sought to be propagated in our cathedrals, churches, schools, and families, will become apparent upon a consideration of the following facts:—

(a.) *The frequent use of the unscriptural and Romish appellation—"SON OF MARY."* The Holy Ghost has indeed, and with intention, proclaimed Jehovah-Jesus to be—"Son of Abraham" assertive of His covenant relation to "the seed;" to be "Son of Man," no fewer than 66 times in the four Gospels, expressive of His Incarnation; and "Son of David," affirmative of His royal dominion and prerogatives. But where has He *once* been spoken of as Son of Mary—as Son of any one of the human race in particular? It was necessary that to redeem His "brethren" He should take part of "the same" flesh as the "children," but of what *individual* is nowhere in inspired Scripture made matter of spiritual significance. Who, then, can doubt the intention of the frequent repetition of the phrase "Son of Mary" in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*? In one hymn alone (number 399), the title occurs no fewer than six times in as many verses. Obviously the purpose of this reiteration is to familiarize the mind with the relation in which the Son of God is by Romanists placed to the Virgin, and to exalt the Virgin at the expense of the Son.

(β.) *The prominence given throughout the work to the relative term "MOTHER."* A careful analysis of the hymnal has revealed the fact that the references to Mary as *Mother*, and the references to God as *Father*, stand thus:—Mary is referred to 56 times in 34 hymns, while God is referred to 84 times in 63 hymns, the proportions being nearly 5 to 8! Thus, by omitting the doxologies, Mary's praises are almost on a par with those of the Divine Father (Vide *Thoughts on Hymns Ancient and Modern*). Did Jesus, the Son of God, once call Mary—*Mother*? Not even once in the whole course of the four Gospels. Let a comparison, then, be made between the Bible and *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, and the reader will fail to find any warrant for that Romish compilation being bound up as it now is with our Scriptural Prayer Book,* as though it were an integral part of our Protestant Church Services.

* The following letter, which appeared in the "*Rock*" since the preparation of this paper for the press, remarkably confirms the above statement. It is really carrying propagandist principles a little too far to thus attempt to thrust this Popish hymnal upon unwilling purchasers.

"SIR,—I beg to call attention to the extensive way in which *Hymns Ancient and Modern* are bound up with the Prayer-book, thus giving them the apparent sanction of authority. The arrangement may be convenient for certain persons, but objectionable to very many. I found, the other evening, that I could not procure a small Prayer-book, at the shop of a tradesman who had a large stock, without taking the Hymns too, quite as a matter of course, as it seemed—P. E."

(γ.) *The sufferings and sorrows of Mary are magnified in order to attract sympathy, and to deepen reverential feelings towards her.* Hymn 117, a composition which owes its birth to the darkest and most corrupt ages of Christendom, being ascribed to the year 1350, and taken from a Romish priest's translation of the Paris Missal, thus appeals to our English congregations:—

“ At the cross *her* station keeping,
 Stood the *mournful Mother* weeping,
 Where He hung, the dying Lord ;
 For *her* soul of joy bereaved.
 Bowed with anguish, deeply grieved,
 Felt the sharp and piercing sword.

“ Oh, how sad and sore distressed
 Now was *she*, that *Mother* blessed
 Of the sole-begotten One ;
 Deep the woe of *her* affliction
 When *she* saw the crucifixion
 Of *her* ever-glorious Son.

“ Who, on Christ's *dear Mother* gazing,
 Pierced by anguish so amazing,
 Born of woman would not weep ?
 Who on Christ's *dear Mother* thinking,
 Such a cup of sorrow drinking,
 Would not share *her* sorrows deep ?

“ For his people's sins chastised,
She beheld *her* Son despised,
 Scourged, and crowned with thorns entwined ;
 Saw Him then from judgment taken,
 And in death by all forsaken,
 Till His spirit He resigned.”

The drift of this Romish hymn is too obvious to need a word of comment. Hymn 101, also, only too clearly inculcates the same Marian doctrine.

“ Oh, hear that awful cry
Which pierced His MOTHER's heart,
 As into God the Father's hands
 He bade His soul depart.”

Why call attention from the Lamb of God, His vicarious sufferings, His anguish, and meritorious death ? Why surreptitiously draw the Protestant worshipper aside by this gratuitous reference to the apocryphal passion of the Virgin Mary ? Indeed, it is open to question by the Gospel narratives whether the Mother of our Lord was not absent from Calvary when the curse-cry, “ *Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani* ” was uttered by the forsaken Saviour.—(See Mr. McSorley's tract). Again, whence did the compilers of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* draw this unscriptural teaching ? From the *Roman Breviary*—thanks to another Roman Catholic priest—E. Caswell. Is such a hymnal, circulating to the extent of 8,000,000 copies, an encouraging feature of our Church's present relations to purity of worship and allegiance to the Word of God ?

(δ) *The direct address of worship to the Virgin Mary.* At first the promoters of hymnological teaching sought to indoctrinate the con-

gregations of our churches only by small and well-disguised potions of Marian poison. The presentation of idolatrous dogma was craftily made in the original work, as we have seen. But suspicion having been allayed by patronage obtained and popularity secured, the compilers boldly brought out an "Appendix" which provided in hymn 450 all that the Roman Catholic devotee of Mary could desire, and put into the mouths of the members of the Protestant Church of the Martyrs the following blasphemous language:—

" Shall we not love THEE, MOTHER DEAR,
Whom Jesus loves so well ?
And, to His glory, year by year,
Thy joy and honour tell ?

* * * *

" And thee He chose from whom to take
True flesh His flesh to be ;
In It to suffer for our sake,
By It to make us free.

* * * *

(Doxology) " Jesu, the Virgin's holy Son,
We praise Thee and adore,
Who art with God the Father One
And Spirit evermore."

Briefly stated, the teaching of this hymn of eight verses is that of the "Glories of Mary," by the Romish St. Alphonsus de Liguori, to which Dr. Manning set his approving signature in 1868. If the worship of a creature be idolatry, and Mary be a creature, then *Hymns Ancient and Modern* is an educational manual in the school of idolatry. If Mary be more than a creature, let it be proved by the Bible, and then let Bishop, Priest, and Deacon preach Rome's Gospel of Mary. Then let our Churches be converted into temples for Mary-worship, and the doctrine of the Trinity be forthwith superseded by the new revelation, the celestial queenship of the Madonna, and the approved extravagancies* of the immaculate conception and the miraculous assumption.

2. IDOLATRY, OR THE WORSHIP OF MATERIAL THINGS.

FOLLOWING naturally upon the worship of a creature comes the worship of material things—the work of men's hands. The toleration in a professedly Christian hymn-book of some of the grossly idolatrous compositions of Romish origin to be found in the pages of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* is truly unaccountable. Foremost among the objects of worship held forth in the hymns is the *material cross*—"the Roman gibbet," as the noble Dean McNeile has tersely put it. We live in a day when the material cross has actually become a fashionable ornament. Crosses surmount our church roofs ; crosses meet us within on every side ; the congregations display crosses ; the clergy wear crosses, make crosses, carry crosses.

* The writer of the Ritualistic Essay on "*The Cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary*," published by the Rev. O. Shipley, boldly avows his belief in the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception," and even quotes the Pope's Bull of Dec. 8, 1854, in support of it. (See page 69 of the Essay.)

Crosses decorate the service books, and hymnals celebrate them.* From the Church of Rome the compilers have largely drawn their inspiration. It is a noteworthy fact that hymn 96 is taken from the Sarum, Roman, and Paris Breviaries; and that the *Annotated edition of Hymns Ancient and Modern* has an appended note, saying, "This hymn was written for the occasion of the reception of a *portion of the Holy Cross* sent to St. Radegund, at Poitiers." Thus, Romish in its origin, and associated with the material cross in its history, it has been adopted by the Church of Rome in its Good Friday service—"The Unveiling and Adoration of the Cross." This, too, is the hymn which used to be sung by the monks, priests, and other ecclesiastics when, in fulfilment of the decrees of the Inquisition, they led the Protestant martyrs of Spain to the stake, commencing—

"Vexilla regis prodeunt;
Fulget Crucis mysterium."

What, then, but undisguised idolatry is Rome's address to the *material* cross, which the compilers have adopted? It is a direct address to the tree—

"O TREE of Glory, TREE most fair,
Ordained those holy limbs to bear," &c. (*verse 4.*)

And, again, what, if not idolatry, is hymn 105, by a Popish Cardinal?

"Thorns, and cross, and nails, and lance,
Wounds, our treasures to enhance,
Vinegar, and gall, and reed,
And the pang His Soul that freed;
May these all our Spirits sate,
And with love inebriate."

Surely to supplicate spiritual blessings by such an appeal to the material instruments of our Lord's passion is not only wholly unwarranted by holy Scripture, but is directly opposed to its positive teaching.

Once more, hymn 97 (from the Romish Missal) presents a most flagrant instance of idolatry—a hymn also addressed to *the cross of wood*—

"Faithful Cross, above all other
One and only noble Tree,
None in foliage, none in blossom,
None in fruit thy peer may be;
Sweetest wood, and sweetest iron;
Sweetest weight is hung on thee.
Bend, O lofty Tree, thy branches,
Thy too rigid sinews bend;
And awhile the stubborn hardness,
Which thy birth bestowed, suspend;
And the Limbs of heaven's high Monarch
Gently on thine arms extend.
Thou alone wast counted worthy
This world's ransom to sustain,
That a shipwrecked race for ever
Might a port of refuge gain,
With the sacred Blood anointed
Of the Lamb for sinners slain."

* The word "cross" occurs 88 times in 62 of the hymns in *Ancient and Modern*.

Are such hymns to be any longer tolerated by authority in our Reformed Church?

3. TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE REAL PRESENCE.

BOLDLY, and beyond all controversy, the doctrine of a real change in the elements of the Lord's Supper is asserted by the compositions contained in the volume under consideration. Thus, hymn 309, taken from the Roman and Paris Breviary, and used at Vespers for the great Festival of *Corpus Christi* in the Roman Catholic Church, in verses 3, 4, and 5, lays down the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the Real Presence of Christ in the elements of bread and wine:—

“That last night, at supper lying,
Mid the Twelve, His chosen band,
JESUS, with the law complying,
Keeps the feast its rites demand;
Then, more precious food supplying,
GIVES HIMSELF with His own Hand.

“Word made Flesh TRUE BREAD HE MAKETH
By His word His Flesh TO BE;
Wine, His blood; which whoso taketh
Must from carnal thoughts be free;
Faith alone, *though sight forsaketh*,
Shows true hearts the mystery.

“Therefore we, BEFORE HIM bending,
This great Sacrament revere;
Types and shadows have their ending,
For the newer rite is here;
Faith, our outward sense befriending,
Makes our inward vision clear.”

The essential verb “*to be*” is Rome's own formula for expressing a substantial change in the elements. This hymn is used by the fallen Church on the chief festival above mentioned, and therefore must be taken as conveying her own mind on this distinctive dogma too emphatically to allow of a question as to the import of the words. Is not its presence as a Communion hymn, then, in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* sufficiently conclusive evidence that the hymnal inculcates the great central error of the great Apostasy? Our Church having plainly protested in Article XXVIII against the figment of any change in the bread and wine, it is inexplicable how this contravention of its authority should be allowed.

Nor does this hymn stand alone; for, the natural sequence to transubstantiation, namely, the *worship* of the Sacrament (that is, the consecrated elements), is as firmly laid down by the hymnal. For instance, number 312, a hymn used in the Romish Church, “through the Octave of *Corpus Christi*,” commences thus:—

“Thee we adore, O HIDDEN Saviour, Thee,
Who IN Thy Sacrament dost deign to be;
Both flesh and spirit at Thy presence fail,
Yet HERE THY PRESENCE we devoutly hail.”

But what if the Saviour be not in those substances of bread and

wine? What awful consequences flow from this false teaching! Our Church scripturally teaches, "No adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine . . . or unto any corporal *presence* of Christ's natural flesh and blood," yet this Church hymnal instructs the people to offer that forbidden *adoration* thereto.

Not to multiply quotations on this subject, the reader is warned against the teaching of hymns 242, 320, 395 (from the Paris Breviary), 311, 313, 315, 316, 322. The priestly pretensions of several passages in these hymns are too palpable to need comment. The falsity of the position taken is to be found in the assertion that Christ is still on earth as Priest and Victim—as Priest in His Ministers, as Victim in the Sacrament.*

4. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

No MORE deadly error is contained in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* than that of the *ex opere operato* principle in connection with the Sacrament of Baptism. Whereas the Church of England has most jealously guarded the truth from Rome's pernicious perversion, restricting the blessing of the ordinance to those that receive it "rightly" (*recte baptismum suscipientes*), the drift of the baptismal hymns in this compilation is to make the act of the officiating minister, and the application of water, the instruments of benefit to the subject of the ordinance. The references to the font, to font-regeneration, and soul-cleansing as the *result* of *water-baptism*, are so frequent as to place it beyond the bounds of question that the tendency of the hymnal is to exalt the rite at the expense of the internal work of the Spirit. To convince the reader how opposed to the Scriptural teachings of the Church of England is the language of some of the baptismal hymns it may be well here to quote the authoritative utterances of Article XXVII: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a *sign of regeneration* or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, *they that receive baptism* RIGHTLY are grafted into the Church; *the promises* of forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, *are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased, BY VIRTUE OF PRAYER* unto God."

* It has been urged by some who use this hymnal, yet profess to have no sympathy with Rome, that the Ritualists have long since left *Hymns Ancient and Modern* in the back-ground as being too mild in its teaching, and have adopted much more advanced collections. Surely, this is a conclusive argument that *Hymns Ancient and Modern* prepares the way for undisguised Popery, and is a strong reason why the first step in a wrong direction should not be taken by adopting it. The following verse is taken from one of the "more advanced" of the Ritualistic hymn books—*Hymnal Noted*.—

"Farewell to types, henceforth
We feed on angels' food;
The guilty slave, Oh, wonder!
EATS THE BODY OF HIS GOD!"

Note well the explicit teaching of the Article. (a.) Baptism is a *sign* of regeneration, and therefore must not be confounded with the thing signified. (b.) The being grafted into the Church of God is made to depend not on the *administration*, but on the right *reception* of the ordinance. (c.) The forgiveness of sin is not said to be conveyed by the rite, but only the promises of God's word, which are addressed to faith, are said to be sealed externally therein. (d.) Prayer unto God, not the act of the officiating minister, nor the contents of the font, nor the pouring out of water from it, is declared to be the secret of spiritual blessing obtained by the right receiver of baptism. Now contrast the following extracts:—

"Eternal Shepherd, Thou art wont
To cleanse Thy sheep *within the font*;
That mystic bath, that grave of sin,
Where ransomed souls *new life* begin."
Hymn 129 (from Roman Breviary.)

"Here from the FONT is poured
Grace on each guilty child." &c.—
Hymn 395 (from Paris Breviary.)

"We love the sacred FONT:
For there the Holy Dove
To pour is ever wont
His blessing from above."—*Hymn 242.*

Now, why this constant ascription to the *font* and the *water* such efficacy? Because the Church of Rome, from whom many of these compositions are taken, ascribes that power to the priestly ministrations at the font. Priestly ambition is at the bottom of the whole function. "Whoever shall affirm that grace is not conferred by these Sacraments of the New Law, *by virtue of the act performed* (ex opere operato), but that faith in the Divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace—let him be anathema." So has the Council of Trent decreed. So speaks the Romish Church in her books of devotion. And so teaches *Hymns Ancient and Modern* by its adoption from those books of their Sacramental doctrines. Thus, then, hundreds of thousands of our fellow-countrymen are being led to imbibe the deadly errors of Popery, and to rest their eternal hopes on a theory of water-salvation and the act of sinful fellow mortals, to the great dishonour of Christ and of God the Holy Spirit.

5. PRAYER FOR THE DEAD.

NEARLY related to the worship of departed saints is that other Roman Catholic custom of praying for the dead. And, though occupying but a comparatively limited place in this hymnal, yet as being placed first in the series appointed for the "Burial of the Dead," it is the more noteworthy. Hymn 398, ascribed to the 13th century, is taken from the Paris Missal, and is usually sung in the Church of Rome in her masses for the dead. The original Latin version concludes thus:—

Judicandus homo reus ;
Huic ergo parce, Deus !
Pie Jesu Domine,
Dona eis requiem !

The compilers applying the final prayer to the person about to be buried, print the pronoun in italic letter so as to accommodate it to either sex, the antecedent *homo* being generic. Thus, in two editions now before me, the verse runs :—

“ Man for judgment must prepare him !
Spare, O God, in mercy spare him !
Lord, all-pitying Jesu blest,
Grant *him* Thine eternal rest !”

The Homily of our Church, “Concerning Prayer,” has declared that the unalterable state of the departed is a sufficient reason why we should not pray for them. “Because the sentence of God is unchangeable, and cannot be revoked again. Therefore let us not deceive ourselves, thinking, that either we may help other, or other may help us by their good and charitable prayers in time to come.” Yet the Ritualists among us are successfully leading their flocks by this deceptive hymnal to practise the folly of praying for the dead. The real intention of the above hymn is best expressed in the words of an article on “Purgatory,” in *Tracts for the Day*, edited by the Rev. O. Shipley:—“What seems to be agreed upon is:—That, meantime, the souls of those persons are benefited by the *Prayers* and *Offerings* of the Church, and by *alms* given in their behalf, that those who have not died beyond the pale of salvation receive *mitigation of their sufferings* and *ultimate release*; and that, *possibly*, those who are *lost* also *gain a mitigation of their sufferings*, which mitigation may last through *Eternity*.”

Is such teaching loyal to our Protestant Church, to the Bible, and to the God of truth? It is surely time that all faithful members of the dear old Church of the Martyrs should bestir themselves to purge it of the leprosy of Popish doctrine which is rapidly spreading by means of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*.

6. SALVATION BY HUMAN WORKS.

THE language of the XXXIX Articles on the subject of salvation by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ is unmistakably clear. It is at direct issue with the Council of Trent. “We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and *not for our own works, or deservings. Good works*, which are the fruits of faith and follow after justification, *cannot* put away our sins, and endure the severity of God’s judgment.” So has our Scriptural Church declared. But Rome says:—“If any one shall say, that after the reception of the grace of justification, the guilt is so remitted to the penitent sinner, and the penalty of eternal punishment is destroyed, that no penalty of *temporal punishment* remains to be paid either in this world, or in the future in purgatory, before the access to the kingdom of Heaven can lie open—*let him be anathema.*”

Now, which doctrine do the following hymns follow, that of the XXXIX Articles or that of Rome? The first quotation is a *Lenten* hymn, which magnifies the merit of abstinence in that season:—

“Blest Three in one, to Thee we bow :
Vouchsafe us in Thy love
To gather from THESE FASTS below
Immortal fruit above.”

Hymn 84, from Paris Breviary.

It is much to be regretted that any Evangelical men can be found introducing, and countenancing this hymnal in their churches, while from their pulpits they are bearing earnest protest against any merit in creature doings, and mere external religion. Charity asks, do they really know the unsound and dangerous nature of so many of the hymns? That the above quotation does not stand alone is proved by hymns 42 and 88, the former being taken from the Paris Breviary, the latter from the Sarum Breviary.

“Its light the joy of heaven reveals
To hearts made pure within ;
And bids us all BY WORTHY DEEDS
Eternal crowns to win.”—*Hymn 42.*

“Then let us all with earnest *care*,
And contrite *fast*, and *tear*, and *prayer*,
And *works* of mercy and of love,
Entreat for pardon from above.”—*Hymn 88.*

Such teaching is contrary to the Gospel scheme of salvation, is opposed to the plain statements of the Articles, and is essentially Romish. To propagate it is to imperil souls, to put a stumbling block in the way of Christ's little ones, and to turn men to broken cisterns which, instead of affording refreshment, only mock their thirsty souls, for they hold no water. It is clearly the duty, therefore, the bounden duty, of every person who knows by gracious experience the blessed liberty wherewith Christ makes His own people free, to warn those who unwittingly are promoting the spread of the false and heretical teaching of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*—to expose its subtle poison—and to endeavour to get it removed as the Achan whose presence must trouble Israel, by finally provoking His wrath, Who, as the God of Truth, ever resents the inventions of sinful man.

I cannot close my observations on this painful and unpopular subject in words more forcible and truthful than those of the faithful Bishop of Huron. “These Hymns”—said the Bishop lately to his clergy—“are only part of a scheme to familiarize our minds with Romish phraseology and doctrines, and thus gradually, but surely, to train our people,—*especially the young*,—for the reception of doctrines and practices contrary to God's Word, contrary to the teaching of our Church, and for the rejection of which the Roman Hierarchy condemned our noble Reformers to be burnt at the stake.”

THE "GAINSAYING OF CORE?"

(St. Jude, verse 11.)

BY THE REV. C. H. WALLER, HAMPSTEAD.

THE "way of Cain," the "error of Balaam," and the "gainsaying of Core," have been grouped together, for some wise reason, in a single sentence of the New Testament. What is the line of thought that unites them? It is not easy to see at the first glance.

The "gainsaying of Core" is especially interesting from its evident connection with the priestly office. The words of St. Jude surely imply that Korah's offence can be repeated under the Christian dispensation. We propose to inquire how such a thing is possible in Gospel times.

The offence of Korah was, that being a Levite of the family of Kohath, but not of the seed of Aaron, he claimed the right to offer incense before the Lord. Not contented with his privileges as a Levite, he sought "the priesthood also." (Num. xvi. 10.)

But who are the priest and Levite of the present dispensation? That there must be some such offices is manifest, or else the "gainsaying of Core" has no meaning for the Christian Church.

There is no lack of authority, ancient or modern, to decide the point. From a very early period in Church History, it has been a favourite practice with some Christians to call New Testament presbyters and deacons by Old Testament names such as Priests and Levites.

Who ever confounded the priests and elders of Israel? And yet between our English Bible and Prayer-book we are in a great strait. The son of Aaron in the English Bible is called a *priest*. But priest is really a shorter form of prester or presbyter, *i.e.* elder. Were the sons of Aaron only elders? And in our Prayer-book, priest means presbyter and nothing else. Or if not, *we have no presbyters*, we have lost the second order in the Apostolic ministry, and have only bishops and deacons. It is a real calamity that we have no English word by which to describe the sacerdotal office of the sons of Aaron, except priest (or presbyter), which means *elder*.

and nothing else. We are thus entangled in a confusion, at least in word, between elders and sacrificers, between the servants of the Church on earth, and the Master and Mediator in heaven above.

Bishop Browne, on the Articles, 6th edition, p. 561, writing upon Article XXIII., "Of Ministering in the Congregation," says, "It was argued upon one occasion, that the sanctity of 'the whole congregation of Israel, made it useless to have priests at all. But how far the argument is safe, the sequel shewed, when 'the earth swallowed up *Korah* (was that so?) and his company, and 'fourteen thousand of the people died of the plague, because they 'had listened to his reasoning.—(Num. xvi. 32, 33, 45-49). It is 'difficult to see where the difference lies between this statement of 'Korah and the modern denial of a Christian ministry, on the ground 'that all the Christian Church is a holy and spiritual priesthood; 'and it is difficult to understand what can be, if this be not, the "'gainsaying of Core,' so strongly rebuked by St. Jude. (v. 11.)"

Thus far the Bishop of Ely. And our whole inquiry is answered, if we accept what he says. According to the Bishop, the "gainsaying of Core" is the denial of any necessity for a Christian ministry. And if this is true, there *must be* some analogy between the Jewish priesthood and the ministry of the Christian Church. This analogy is worked out at some length by the Bishop in the pages following the above extract. He goes on to say, "It was foretold by Isaiah, (lxvi. 21) that when the Gentiles were brought in, 'that is, in the days of the Church of Christ, some among them 'should be taken for 'priests and Levites.' This looks much like a 'prophecy of a *ministry to be established under the Gospel, with some 'analogy to that under the law.*" The analogy is then worked out, somewhat on the following plan.

<i>In the law.</i>	<i>In the time of our Lord.</i>	<i>Afterwards.</i>
High Priest.	The Lord Jesus.	Apostles (and Bishops).
Priests.	The twelve Apostles.	Elders.
Levites.	The seventy Disciples.	Deacons.

We are not disputing the necessity for distinct orders of ministers in the Christian Church. The question is, not whether there ought to be bishops, presbyters, and deacons in the Church of Christ, but whether presbyters and deacons ought to be called priests and Levites; and to what extent these portions of the Bible which speak of priests and Levites may be applied by analogy to the ministers of Christ. Such analogies may be easily constructed, to please the fancy. But have they any real weight? This is a serious

question when we come to such passages as that in the epistle of St. Jude. "The gainsaying of Core," whether literal or spiritual, is no light offence. The persons of whom St. Jude has spoken are denounced with a solemn woe. They "perished in the gainsaying of Core." Surely it is of some importance to decide what this deadly offence can be. Whether it be the denial of a Christian ministry altogether, or be connected with some particular offence in the ministry, it is no trifle. And therefore we cannot afford to trifle with such explanations as the one before us, and such analogies as the one we are attempting to discuss. If the sentence against Korah can be applied to those who differ from us upon the subject of church order, the whole question ought to be treated far more seriously than it usually is.

For the sake of testing the interpretation already indicated, let us apply the principle strictly to the gainsaying of Korah, and observe the result. Let it be granted that the presbyter answers to the Jewish priest, and the deacon to the Levite. We turn to the narrative of Korah in Numbers xvi. and what do we find?

We find that Korah, of the tribe of Levi, a member of the family of Kohath, and Dathan and Abiram and On, who were Reubenites, with others whose names are not recorded, rebelled against the authority of Moses and Aaron in the Israelitish camp. It would appear from the words of Moses, that the rebels had not all the same object; though they had agreed to rebel. Korah asserted his equality with Aaron, while Moses was the principal object of the enmity of Dathan and Abiram.

The words of Moses' remonstrance with Korah run thus:—"Hear, I pray you, *ye sons of Levi*: seemeth it but a small thing unto you, that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel, to bring you near to Himself, *to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord, and to stand before the congregation to minister unto them?* And He hath brought thee near unto Him, and all thy brethren the sons of Levi with thee; *and seek ye the priesthood also? For which cause both thou and all thy company are gathered together against the Lord; and what is Aaron that ye murmur against him?*"

Observe the office of the Levite (or deacon?) as here described by the words in italics; and also the object of Korah and his company.

According to our analogy, these Kohathites were *presumptuous deacons, seeking to usurp the office of the presbyter*: and Korah their leader seemed to claim the episcopate itself.

Dathan and Abiram, when summoned by Moses, made no mention of the priesthood, but complained that Moses was "making himself

altogether a *prince* over them." This grievance does not concern our present inquiry, and need not be further discussed here.

Returning to the ginsaying of Korah, we observe the final settlement of the question between him and Aaron. Korah and the sons of Levi were commanded to draw near with their censers before the Lord, and Aaron with them, to burn incense; that they might see which of them the Lord would choose. They did so, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; and we know the result. "There came out a fire from the Lord and consumed the 250 men that offered incense." Korah, we must suppose, was among them. We cannot think that his company perished and that he was left standing side by side with Aaron, a priest accepted before the Lord. Dathan and Abiram died by their tents on the south side of the tabernacle, but in a different way. The earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up; and they perished from among the congregation.*

We see by this narrative what the peculiar privilege of the priesthood really was. *It was not the right to sacrifice, but to burn incense.* This has been too much overlooked. For a priest was not absolutely essential to *sacrifice* under the Jewish law.

Samuel, himself a descendant of Korah, and not a priest, sacrificed continually; and Saul was rebuked for offering a burnt-offering without waiting for him. Sacrifices were offered by young men of the children of Israel, at Sinai, before Aaron's consecration (Exodus xxiv. 5) and by Levites (apparently) in the court of the temple itself, in the reign of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix. 39).

What was never done by a Levite,—never done in Israel at all until the days of Aaron,—what Korah wanted to do, was *to burn incense*. It was this duty that *brought the priest daily within the tabernacle*. For this the high priest entered once a year into the Holy of Holies. Excepting this, there were very few things connected with the priestly office, which the Levites might not also do, if circumstances required. The right to burn incense, if it could be once established, carried all priestly privileges in its train. But

* There is one passage, Num. xxvi. 10, which *seems* to assert that Korah was swallowed up also. But it does not really say so; indeed, it is most interesting to observe how carefully the Masoretic pointing of the Hebrew text has been adapted to guard against any such notion, and to avoid a contradiction of Num. xvi. The verse reads literally thus:—"And the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up, and Korah in the death of the company; in the fire's devouring the 250 men, and they were for a sign." The E. V. has put the comma after Korah, and given a less accurate sense. It is clear that Korah died with the 250 who were devoured by fire.

incense was very seldom burnt *outside* the tabernacle, perhaps never, except when Aaron stood between the living and the dead, and the plague, which was one consequence of this very 'gainsaying,' was stayed. Incense was not burnt outside the tabernacle, and into the tabernacle the Levites might not go. It was therefore most fitting that the question between Korah the Levite, and Aaron the priest, should be thus decided. *Incense* involves the whole distinction between a Priest and Levite. Which of them could offer incense acceptable before the Lord?

We see now, to what conclusion this interpretation of the gainsaying of Korah will surely lead. If that 'gainsaying' has to do with the Christian ministry, and the presbyter is Priest, and the deacon is Levite, it follows that *for a deacon to seek to usurp the office of a presbyter is presumptuous sin.*

Korah was not one of those persons who deny the necessity of orders altogether, though that was his pretext. His true object was exposed by Moses. Not content with the office of a Levite, he sought the priesthood also. And there was no possibility of promotion. *No Levite ever could become a priest, except he was of Aaron's seed*; and then he was a priest by birth. The difference between priests and Levites was a difference not of order, but of race—a difference of *kind*, and not of *degree*.

The censers of Korah's gainsaying were made broad plates for a covering of the altar, to be a memorial to the children of Israel, *that no stranger, which is not of the seed of Aaron, come near to offer incense before the Lord*, that he be not as *Korah* and as his company. There is something more than a mere distinction of rank and order implied by this *difference of seed*. We cannot of course presume to interpret the 'gainsaying of Korah' with authority. We are sure, however, that it means far more than any erroneous opinion upon the distinction of Holy Orders in the Church of Christ. It is evidently some assumption of the *priesthood*, by a minister who is not and never can be a *priest*.

We know from the epistle to the Hebrews, that there *are no priests on earth*, except the children of Aaron: that if Christ himself "were on earth he would not be a priest." Heb. viii. 4. We know also that, in the fulfilment of Aaron's office, He has entered by the blood of His own sin-offering, with the incense of His own merits, within the veil. There shall be no man in the tabernacle, when He goeth in, "until He come out." Lev. xvi. 17. Therefore there can be no other incense, just as there can be no other sin-offering for the people, except His. All external priestly functions are in abeyance,

until Christ comes again. No man can go into the tabernacle ; and incense is not offered outside.

Hence we gather the following conclusion. *It is impossible that the Presbyters of the Church of Christ can answer to the Priests of Israel, because the position of Christ himself, forbids the discharge of any of those functions which are the peculiar privilege of the priesthood, until He comes again.*

And if the presbyter does not answer to the priest, then there can be no *special* analogy between the deacon and the Levite. And Christ Himself, in heaven is the sole High Priest.

We have observed that the New Testament nowhere countenances the analogy which we have just discarded. But it is remarkable that the New Testament does indicate an analogy between ministers of the Church of Christ generally, and the ancient Levites. The service of the Levites, one and all, is styled a *warfare*, which is the more remarkable because they had no military duties, "but they were to *war the warfare of the tabernacle* of the congregation." This word *warfare* is used in Numbers iv. 23, 30, 35, 39, 43, in the original, to describe the business of a Levite, and in ver. 23, 30, it has been given as a marginal reading of the English version. If this fact be observed, we can scarcely fail to trace allusions to it in St. Paul's writings, when he speaks of himself and Barnabas as "going a warfare," 1 Cor. ix. 7, and charges Timothy to "war a good warfare," 1 Tim. i. 18, "to endure hardness as a good soldier," 2 Tim. ii. 3, &c. ; and speaks of himself as having "fought the good fight," 2 Tim. iv. 7, and charges Timothy to do the same, 1 Tim. vi. 12. In these passages we do recognize a manifest allusion to the position of the Levites under the law of Moses, but we can find no such allusion to the duties of the Jewish priests. When all the true seed of Aaron are manifested in His likeness, and seen to be children of God by being children of *the resurrection*, when the saints of the Most High shall take the *kingdom*, and possess the kingdom for ever, then we believe they will have the *priesthood* also, but not before. Our Saviour Christ on earth had neither kingdom nor priesthood. Let his followers be as He was, and wait for both these offices until they can share them both with Him.

May we not connect the way of Cain, the error of Balaam, and the gainsaying of Core, by the one common idea of *unlawful offering* which is involved in all three? Cain, who "brought of *the fruit of the ground an offering*," instead of the blood of a lamb, the fruits of human labour instead of the life given by God ; Balaam, whose "error" or "doctrine" it was, to have the children of Israel taught

to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication; Korah, who, not content to war the warfare of the tabernacle, sought the priesthood also, and the right to offer incense before the Lord—are they not all reproduced in the corrupt doctrines, and yet more corrupt practices, of the sacrificing priesthood of the Church of Rome? Have not Sacerdotalists reason to tremble, lest they “perish in the gainsaying of Core?”

A few words more are needful to guard our position from being misunderstood. It may be asked, Are there no true priests, no true sacrifices in the Church of Christ? If not, how could the Levitical priesthood and the Levitical sacrifices be types and shadows? If they have no corresponding realities, what were they shadows of? To this we answer, there are *true priests* and *true sacrifices*, in the Church of Christ. St. Paul speaks of “*ministering* the Gospel of God (perhaps as a priest) that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost,” Rom. xv 16. If any one likes to say that the Christian minister is a priest who offers up his people as a spiritual sacrifice, we can find no fault with that. In that sense any one may offer himself as a living sacrifice to God. But that is a very different thing from the offering of a material sacrifice as an atonement for sin. A *true sacrifice* is not material, and a *true priest* is not a priest whose office is concerned with outward and visible things. The Lord’s Supper is not a *material sacrifice*, for no part of the elements is consumed by God. But, as Waterland has well shown, the Lord’s Supper is a *TRUE sacrifice*, i.e. a real invisible offering and presentation of Christian hearts and affections. “Ye are a royal priesthood to offer up *spiritual sacrifices*, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” The realities of the Gospel are *spiritual, invisible, eternal*. If they were outward and visible, they would be unreal, and only *shadows over again*. “The things that are unseen are eternal.” The real priesthood of the New Testament is not restricted to ministers, but extends to every member of Christ. As the seed of Aaron were the only lawful priests in Israel, so the seed of Christ are the only lawful priests now. And the *ministers of the Church are not more the seed of Christ than the rest of His people*. Whosoever has the spirit of Christ is truly a priest with Christ, a priest in heaven. But externally there are no priests, even as Christ was not a priest on earth. Ritualism therefore, is unreal, because it is outward and visible. It is not one of the realities of the Christian dispensation. And an earthly priesthood, which is concerned with external orders, and rites, and ceremonies, and vestments, is *no real priesthood*, simply because it is

earthly and visible. It is itself a *shadow*, and cannot be the fulfilment of shadows gone before. If modern Ritualism is the fulfilment of Levitical shadows, then those Levitical shadows were types of future types, and shadows of future shadows, and the reality is yet to come. And if Ritualism is essential to the Church of Christ, then the essentials of the Christian Church are shadows of things to come, and the Church is not the very body of Christ. Whatever be the Christian reality which corresponds to the offering of incense, it is open to all the seed of the Lord Jesus. If it be a priestly function it belongs to all the seed of the great High Priest. No single member of the Church of Christ can take it upon himself and exclude others, for all are equally the true Aaron's seed. This was more than could be said for Korah. If he had been of the seed of Aaron the priesthood would have been his. We cannot be too careful to separate the sacerdotal office from Holy Orders. We have seen that the New Testament indicates an analogy between Levites and all Christian ministers, even the Apostles themselves. The office of a Levite was to do the service of the tabernacle, and to stand before the congregation to minister unto them. The Levites were instead of the firstborn of Israel; they represented the old Patriarchal ministry, in which there was no distinct order of priesthood, but the head of the family was *ex officio* priest. See Num. iii. 41. And there was far less difference between Levites and Israelites than between Levites and priests. Levites and Israelites were alike admitted into the court of the tabernacle. Levites and Israelites were alike forbidden to enter the Holy place. There was nothing essentially sacerdotal about the duties of the Levites. They performed certain duties on behalf of Israel, in the place of the firstborn; duties which, as a matter of order, could not well be performed by all. "Let all things be done decently and in order," the motto of our present services, would apply to the duties of the Levites equally well. If we keep within these limits there is little danger of our Christian ministry becoming a pretended priesthood. And once admit that the New Testament marks an analogy between all ministers and Levites, the gainsaying of Korah becomes an emphatic warning that *Christian presbyters never can be priests.**

* A good deal is sometimes made of the words *leitourgeo* and *leitourgos* (minister), as though they necessarily signified the discharge of a priestly function in the New Testament. In Rom. xiii. 4, the magistrate is called God's *leitourgos*. Is he therefore a priest?

INCENSE.

BY THE REV. HELY H. SMITH.*

INCENSE is an innovation in English Churches—an innovation which the law has prohibited. The censuring persons or things, whether during the celebration of the Holy Communion or during other parts of Divine Service, has been pronounced illegal, and has been ordered to be discontinued by the Judgment of the Dean of Arches in the cases of *Martin v. Mackonochie*, and of *Elphinstone v. Purchas* (Law Reports, Ecclesiastical Cases, Vol. II. 1867-69, pp. 211-215, and Vol. III. Part 1, 1869-70, pp. 99-101). In the face of these Judgments the practice is adhered to. Surely there must be strong ground for the use of incense to account for this persistent open violation of the law by those, whose business it is to teach—and *à fortiori* to practise—submission to the powers that be. Let us examine the ground they take up, and see whether it is good standing ground or not.

It is argued that incense was offered by God's command in the worship, which He Himself instituted; this is true, but it is also true:—

I. That God Himself prescribed the ingredients and quantities, and that His penalty for making it of any other substances or in different proportions—in short, that to attempt to imitate it was—*death*.

II. He decreed, that only the priests He had appointed might offer it, and the penalty for infringing this rule was—*death*.

III. He commanded, that it should only be lighted by fire from heaven, and those, who presumed to use any other fire, found that the penalty of their disobedience was—*death*.

I. The ingredients, quantities, and method of making, are told us in the following passage:—

“And the Lord said unto Moses, Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte, and onycha, and galbanum; these sweet spices with pure frankincense; of each shall there be

* Author of ‘High Church, or Audi Alteram Partem.’—Bemrose, 10, Paternoster Buildings. Price One Shilling.

a like weight; And thou shalt make it a perfume, ■ confection, after the art of the apothecary, tempered together, pure and holy: And thou shalt beat some of it very small; and put it before the testimony in the tabernacle of the congregation, where I will meet with thee; it shall be unto you most holy. And as for the perfume, which thou shalt make, ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord. WHOSOEVER SHALL MAKE LIKE UNTO IT, to smell thereto, SHALL EVEN BE CUT OFF FROM HIS PEOPLE."

"And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at even, he shall burn incense upon it, a perpetual incense before the Lord throughout your generations. YE SHALL OFFER NO STRANGE INCENSE thereon."—Ex. xxx. 34—38.

But it is impossible in the present day to make incense, such as God prescribed, because it is not known what spices the Hebrew words specify; probably they are wholly unknown to us; indeed, the attempt to follow God's instructions has been given up; the various ingredients for making the modern incense, include cascarilla, benzoin, styrax, Burgundy pitch, musk, and burnt sugar.

II. The sin for which Korah, Dathan, and Abiram and their followers were punished was, that not being priests, they presumed to burn incense—

"And there came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense.—And Eleazar the priest took the brazen censers, wherewith they that were burnt had offered; and they were made broad plates for a covering of the altar: To be a memorial unto the children of Israel, that no stranger, which is not of the seed of Aaron, come near to offer incense before the Lord; that he be not as Korah and as his company."—Num. xvi. 35, 39, 40.

Even a king might not presume to take this office unto himself. Uzziah, King of Judah, was struck with leprosy for usurping the priestly office in this respect.

"But when he was strong, his heart was lifted up to his destruction; for he transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the temple of the Lord, to burn incense upon the altar of incense. And Azariah the priest went in after him, and with him fourscore priests of the Lord, that were valiant men; and they withstood Uzziah the king, and said unto him, It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense: go out of the sanctuary; for thou hast trespassed; neither shall it be for thine honour from the Lord God. Then Uzziah was wroth, and had a censer in his hand to burn incense; and while he was wroth with the priests, the leprosy even rose up in his forehead before the priests in the house of the Lord, from beside the incense altar. And Azariah the chief priest, and all the priests, looked upon him, and, behold, he was leprous in his forehead, and they thrust him out from thence; yea, himself hastened also to go out, because the Lord had smitten him. And Uzziah the king was a leper unto the day of his death, and dwelt in a several house, being a leper; for he was cut off from the house of the Lord."—2 Chron. xxvi. 16—21.*

* According to Josephus there was a fearful earthquake at the same time.—Ant. ix. 10 § 4. This seems confirmed by Zechariah, "Yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, King of Judah."—Zech. xiv. 5; Amos i. 1.

III. The sin for which Nadab and Abihu were punished with death, was because though they were priests, and therefore had not only a right to offer incense, but were bound to do so, yet that they lighted it with "strange fire," that is, with other fire than that which came originally direct from heaven:—

"And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not, and there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord."—Lev. x. 1-2.

But now, instead of the incense being made according to God's prescription, it is made to suit the fancy of the celebrant.

Instead of being burnt only by a divinely appointed priest, it is swung about by a boy! instead of being lighted by fire from heaven, it is lighted by hands stained by disobedience to the law.

If it be said, "Then, if these things be so impious as you imply, why does not fire come down from heaven, or the earth open as of old, and punish those guilty of the impiety?" I answer, many persons have told lies since Ananias and Sapphira, whom God has not struck dead on the spot, yet His hatred of lies was shown by His judgment upon those offenders against truth in the early Christian Church. In like manner, many may be guilty of the sin of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and of Nadab and Abihu, without being visited with the same instant judgment as overtook them, but the warning contained in those judgments does not, therefore, lose its force.

But a passage in an unfulfilled prophecy of Malachi, and referring to a totally different dispensation, is quoted to support the use of incense, "In every place shall incense be offered unto my Name."—Malachi i. 2. And so it shall, and so shall the lion eat straw like an ox, and the wolf lie down with the lamb, but the time is not come yet.

But it is said again, that in the Revelation we find incense offered with the prayers of the Saints. It is true—but then that is in Heaven, not on earth. It is offered by an angel, is supplied from Heaven's treasury, and is followed by the most solemn indications of God's wrath against the disobedient.

"And another ANGEL came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was GIVEN UNTO him much incense that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand. And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth; and there were VOICES, and THUNDERINGS, and LIGHTNINGS, and an EARTHQUAKE."—Revelation, chap. viii. 3-4-5.

Thus much for the *Scripture* testimony, from which I conclude, that God's verdict on this revival of a popish custom is given in His own words: "Incense is an abomination unto me."—Isaiah i. 13. And that the very ground occupied by those, who persist in this innovation, instead of being strong enough (as they would have us believe) to make it their duty to defy the laws of the land, is in reality no ground at all, but only a dangerous quicksand.

It may be as well to add, that it is useless for our incense-burners to appeal either to the Church or her officials to support them in their illegal and unscriptural practice.

Our Church makes no provision for incense-burning—there are no rubrics decreeing when it is to be introduced; nor does she afford any opportunity for its introduction: surely it cannot be said in such a case, that silence gives consent; but in her Homilies, she is not silent:—

"Let us honour and worship, for religion's sake, none but Him; not in lighting of candles, BURNING OF INCENSE, &c., for all these be *abominations* before God."—3rd Part of *Sermons against Peril of Idolatry*, towards the end.

Such is the Church's verdict!

Since the time of the Reformation the burning of incense has been abandoned until recently introduced; therefore, the testimony of the officials of the Church against it is not to be looked for, as it has not been required; but Archbishop Grindall, in his Injunctions to the Laity speaks very decidedly:—

"Item, that the Churchwardens and Ministers shall see that . . . ALL CENSERS . . . and all other relics and monuments of idolatry be utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed."—*Park. Soc. Ed.* p. 134.

Hence in the matter of incense-burning, as in most of their other innovations, our extreme Ritualists not only defy the laws of their country and of their God, but are actually dissenters from that very Church, of which they so arrogantly and superciliously claim to be pre-eminently the pillars and representatives.

THE BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS ON THE RITUALISTS.

It is notorious that there are those in the Church at the present day who have deliberately and avowedly undertaken the task of revolutionizing the Church of England as to her doctrine and her ritual, and of effecting her reunion with the Church of Rome. There is scarcely a single doctrine of that corrupt communion which it has not been attempted of late to bring back among us. The depreciation of the Bible as the rule of faith, and the exaltation of the Church as a fountain of revelation; the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead; solitary masses as sacrifices by which non-communicants are benefited; such a local presence of the Lord Jesus in the consecrated elements as to be a proper object of worship, a worship directed to the elements as containing Him; the invocation and worship of the Virgin Mary, and prayers for her intercession; auricular confession and priestly absolution; penance, purgatory, and so on, not one of which was taught or practised in the ante-Nicene Church. And, together with these, have been introduced a whole host of practices of a minor kind, all savouring of Romanism, and intended to familiarize the Anglican worshipper with Roman ways. The English priests and deacons are to be dressed as like as possible to Romish priests and deacons; the church choristers are to be as like as possible to the acolytes and choristers in a Romish church; the Lord's Table is to be made and dressed as like as possible to the altar of a Romish church; the chants and music to be as like as possible to those in the Church of Rome; the processions, banners, crosses, and crucifixes of Romish ceremonials

are to be exactly imitated; the Roman use of incense and wafer bread is to be adopted; in short, in everything Anglican worship is to be assimilated as closely as possible to the worship in Belgian, Italian, and other Romish Churches. Then, again, we are introduced to a variety of supplements to the Prayer Book. Offices are provided for the consecration of portable altars, for the benediction of church bells, for the consecration of chrism and holy oil with which to anoint the sick, for the blessing of altar cloths, corporals, patens, pyxes, albs, chasubles, etc. We have offices, too, for the admission of novices, male and female; for the profession of brothers and sisters; for the installation of superiors of brotherhoods, and mother superiors of sisterhoods; and we have a great variety of litanies, for the dead as well as for the living, all as unlike the Litany of the Church as it is possible to conceive. There are offices, too, for the blessing of salt and water; and the priest (*i.e.* the English clergyman) is to throw the salt into the water in the form of a cross, saying, "Let this mixture be made in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And there are offices for blessing candles for Candlemas day, and for blessing ashes for Ash Wednesday, and for blessing palms and flowers for Palm Sunday; and there are benedictions of service books, of thuribles, of incense, of tapers, of crucifixes, of medals, of church banners, etc. We are also favoured with works which pass through two or more editions, in which among other things, the clergy are instructed as to what is necessary to a devout celebration and communion. Among them I find that he ought not to wash his teeth in the morning before he communicates, for fear of drinking a drop of water, and so breaking his fast, nor to cough afterwards; and that it is the celebrant's duty to rinse out the chalice after celebration, and to pour water over his fingers into the chalice, and then to drink the water, with much more of the same kind which it is sickening to mention. Another method largely used for familiarising the English Churchman's mind with Roman Catholic doctrine, is the introduction and recommendation on a large scale of Roman Catholic books of devotion, and especially books connected with Confession, and with the (so-called) sacrifice

of the altar. The mind is thus familiarised with the teaching of Liguori and Ignatius Loyola, and with breviaries and missals, and alienated from the language of the Anglican Prayer Book and the doctrines of the Anglican Church.

All this, together with the tone used by certain writers, and the endeavour to hoot down those, who resist the attempt to Romanize the Church of England, as if they were not true Churchmen, but ignorant, uncatholic dissenters, convinces me that there is a deliberate conspiracy on foot somewhere to bring back the Church of England to communion with, and obedience to the Pope of Rome. Indeed, if all these doctrines and practices, which I have detailed, are and ought to be the practices and doctrines of the English Church, I am at a loss to know on what grounds our separation from Rome can be justified. The question of the precise degree of authority to be exercised by the Bishop of Rome over the Western Churches is hardly one of sufficient importance to create a great schism; the difference between the doctrine of transubstantiation and that taught by the new school is absolutely insignificant in the region of religion; and there is no other important question at issue, that I am aware of, between Rome and England. So that we are brought face to face with the question, Shall the Church of England return to her allegiance to the Church of Rome? Shall the mighty Revolution of the 16th century be undone, and shall we have a Restoration? A restoration of the Popedom on British soil? A restoration of all those corruptions, those follies, those idolatries, those perversions of the truth, those wretched debasing superstitions, and that priestly tyranny, which for so many centuries almost quenched the light of Christianity, and annihilated the liberties of the laity? Shall we exchange our Prayer Books for breviaries and missals; close our Bibles and take up with the lives of Saints, or the "Garden of the Soul;" in a word, submit to the decrees of the Council of Trent, and the last Œcumenical Council of Rome?

If we are not prepared to do this, if we are determined, by God's grace, to stand to the Reformation, and if we are satisfied that such teaching as that, of which I have given specimens, is not in harmony

with the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, and with the doctrine which the Apostles, illuminated by the Holy Ghost, delivered to the Churches all over the world, nor with the doctrine for which the fathers of the English Reformation laid down their lives, and which they have handed down to us, then it is time for us to make a stand against the attempt to reimpose Popery upon the English Church. We must not allow ourselves to drift gradually and unconsciously into the communion of Rome. We must not be like the silly daughters of Pelias, and allow our Church to be dismembered, limb by limb, in the vain hope that in the hands of our modern Medeas she will come forth in renewed youth and beauty. And I appeal to you, my brethren of the clergy, and to you, my brethren of the laity, to help in withstanding the astounding growth of that spirit which gives birth to the kind of religion I have described.—*Extract from the Charge of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1873 ;—pp. 10—14.*

THE REAL PRESENCE.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM FRANCIS TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D.

I. It is of the utmost importance that we rightly understand the meaning of the expression "the Real Presence;" as otherwise we may be contending against what is not maintained, or rejecting what ought to be embraced most firmly.

II. The Church of England no where uses the phrase, "The Real Presence" in reference to the Lord's Supper. It was an expression equivalent in the minds of the Reformers to the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation. Thus Cranmer speaks of "The Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the *real presence* of CHRIST's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar, as they call it."

Still, a real presence of CHRIST not only may be, but must be maintained by every true Christian; a real presence, that is of "CHRIST and his Holy Spirit by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace, *not in or under the form of bread and wine, but in all them that worthily receive the same.*" Nor is this real presence confined to the right use of the Lord's Supper. It is also to be maintained in the right use of all the ordinances of CHRIST's Church, and all the means of grace whether public or private.

III. The Ritualists, however, use the expression, if not exactly in the Popish sense as equivalent to transubstantiation yet to express substantially the same doctrine; and to deny this is a mere juggle of words without meaning.

Their doctrine is this:

"That by virtue of consecration the Body and Blood of our Saviour, CHRIST, are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably *under the form of bread and wine.*" "This presence is conferred by the word of CHRIST, as spoken by the priest, through the operation of the HOLY GHOST, *irrespective of faith and of any personal qualification*, either in the consecrator or receiver." (Declaration of twenty-one priests: and Mackonochie's pastoral.)

This language is plain. It matters not whether it be called transubstantiation or consubstantiation; superlocal or supralocal; ineffable, transcendental, mysterious or spiritual. The meaning is plain, viz., that the real Body and Blood of CHRIST are really and truly present *on the table, under the form of bread and wine.*

IV. It is not necessary at present to point out that if this be so, the Adoration of the Host, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, are but legitimate consequences of the doctrine; but the object of this paper

is to prove that the doctrine of the Real Presence, as thus defined, is contrary to the Church of England.

1. In the Prayer of Consecration, we ask God to grant that "*we receiving these his creatures of bread and wine*, according to our Saviour JESUS CHRIST's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, *may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.*"

This petition would be wholly needless if CHRIST were really present under the form of bread and wine; for in that case he that received the one must also receive the other. The petition therefore would be, not that we may be partakers, but that we may be *worthy* partakers.

2. In the second post communion prayer, we thank God for that he does "*vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries (i. e. sacred emblems) with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour, CHRIST.*"

Here the reception of the Body and Blood is confined to those who "*duly receive.*" Not so, however, if the Real Presence be under the form of bread and wine, irrespective of any personal qualification on the part of the receiver.

3. In the declaration, at the end of the Communion Service, we are told that "*no adoration ought to be done unto any Corporal Presence of CHRIST's natural Flesh and Blood. * * For the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour, CHRIST, are in Heaven, and not here;*" it being against the truth of CHRIST's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.

Note here—*any Corporal Presence* is denied by the Church. The word corporal means bodily, and can mean nothing else. So that the Church rejects any bodily presence of CHRIST: no matter what words are used to mystify plain people, such as *supra-local*, *ineffable*, and *mysterious*; to all such we reply, *the Church rejects any bodily presence whatever.*

The Ritualists try to evade the force of this by saying, that, whilst the natural Body of CHRIST is in heaven, the spiritual Body is on the table. What ridiculous absurdity, and heretical withal. Has CHRIST two bodies, a natural and a spiritual: one in heaven and the other on earth? It would be an insult to the understanding of a child to attempt to refute that, which carries its own refutation with it; just as much as to assert that one and one make three.

4. In the Communion of the Sick we are told that "*if the sick man do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe in the Blood of CHRIST shed for his redemption, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.*"

Here we have Real Presence in the soul of the penitent believer *independent* of the Sacrament altogether.

The Catechism teaches us "that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are verily and indeed taken and received by *the faithful* in the LORD's Supper." This limitation of the reception to the personal qualification of the receiver, the faithful, is fatal to the idea of a real presence independent of faith. The faithful, and the faithful only, *i.e.* those, who are indeed believers in CHRIST, find a real presence; a real presence of CHRIST within their hearts, not in the elements.

6. The 28th Article declares that "the Body of CHRIST is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*. And *THE mean* whereby the Body of CHRIST is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."

This would not be true if the Body is eaten by the mouth; for this is not spiritual, but natural and carnal. Nor is it true, that *the Mean*—the *one, only*, mean of reception is Faith, if we receive it also in the hand. The doctrine of the 28th Article is therefore against the notion of the Ritualistic Real Presence, and agrees with the beautiful expression of Hooker, that "*Faith is the only hand which putteth on Christ to justification, and Christ the only garment which being so put on covereth the shame of our defiled natures.*"

7. The 29th Article is "of the wicked who *eat not* the Body of CHRIST in the Lord's Supper."

This one Article is conclusive, if even it stood alone; for it declares that "the wicked, and such as be void of a living faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, *yet in no wise are partakers of Christ*; but rather to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing."

Note here—those, that are destitute of a living faith, are *in no wise* partakers of CHRIST, although they do eat and drink the outward sign or Sacrament. This would not be true if there were a Real Presence irrespective of faith; for then they would *in some wise*, even if to their condemnation, receive CHRIST. But now they "*in no wise*" receive the Body, but only the sign of the Body.

Observe, too, the contrast between the statements in the Catechism and in this place.

The *faithful* receive the Body and Blood of CHRIST verily and indeed in the Lord's Supper; yea, whether they receive the Lord's Supper or not. (*Vide Communion of Sick.*)

The *faithless* are in no wise partakers of CHRIST, whether they eat the Sacrament or no. (*Art. xxix.*)

It is evident, therefore, that the doctrine of the Church is in perfect accordance with that of Holy Scripture on this subject. CHRIST is the bread of life. He that cometh to me, saith the Saviour, shall never hunger; he that believeth on me shall never thirst. Therefore, to come is to eat; to believe is to drink. Again: "he that *believeth* on me hath everlasting life; and whoso eateth my flesh and

drinketh my blood hath everlasting life." The same result—everlasting life—is connected with believing on CHRIST, or eating his flesh and drinking his blood. These expressions then are equivalent—mean the same spiritual action; unless indeed we maintain, that we can have eternal life by eating without believing, or by believing without eating.

V. The Ritualistic Real Presence is contrary to the views of the Reformers.

Cranmer says—

"They say that CHRIST is corporally under or in the form of bread and wine, we say that CHRIST is not there, *neither corporally nor spiritually*; but in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine he is spiritually, and corporally in heaven." (P. S. p. 5.)

Hooker says—

"The Real Presence of CHRIST's most blessed Body and Blood is *not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.*" (Vol. ii. p. 5.)

Jeremy Taylor—

"CHRIST is present in the Sacrament to our spirits only, *i. e. not present to any other sense* but that of faith. CHRIST is present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace." (p. 522.)

"Where, now, is the difference? Here by 'spiritually,' they mean present after the manner of a spirit; by 'spiritually,' we mean present to our spirits only; that is, so as CHRIST is not present to any other sense but that of faith, a spiritual suspension." (Real Presence, p. 15.)

Again—

"But we by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present, as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace." (Ibid.)

Lastly—to quote the Judgment of the Privy Council in the Bennett case, delivered June 8th, 1872—we read,

"Any other presence than this—ANY PRESENCE WHICH IS NOT A PRESENCE TO THE SOUL OF THE FAITHFUL RECEIVER—the Church does not by her Articles and Formularies affirm, or require her ministers to accept. This cannot be stated too plainly."

Protestant Churchmen, enough has now been written, not merely to assert, but to prove that the doctrine of the Real Presence as taught by the Ritualists of our day, is unscriptural, anti-Reformational, and expressly condemned by the formularies of the Church.

Wherever this doctrine is held, it is accompanied by the blasphemous Sacrifice of the Mass and the idolatrous worship of the Host. Already, this is the case in countless churches throughout the land. If the plague be not arrested and eliminated from the National Church, it must lose its hold on public opinion and fall.

Let us make an effort to prevent such a catastrophe.

To be obtained at the Office of the Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London.
By Subscribers, for distribution, free. By others at 3d per dozen, or 1s 6d per 100.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION MOVEMENT AND HOW TO MEET IT.

PAPER READ BY THE REV. A. BARING-GOULD, M.A.,
VICAR OF ELLACOMBE, TORQUAY,

At the Church Association Conference, held at Wolverhampton, on the
28th November, 1873, on the following subject:—

"How may a correct knowledge of the doctrines of our Reformed Church be extended with faithfulness and soundness of judgment, so that spiritual life may be further developed in Congregations, and the people guarded against the manifold errors which now assail the Truth."

In this question it is evidently intended that our minds should in the first place be directed to "the manifold errors which now assail the Truth;" and these errors being ascertained and admitted, the remedy proposed is the extension of a "correct knowledge of the doctrines of our Reformed Church." This extension of knowledge, however, is to be made under a most important condition, viz., that "spiritual life may be further developed in our congregations."

The preliminary inquiry would therefore naturally be, What are "the manifold errors which now assail the Truth?" Upon this point, however, it is but too evident that little need be said. When things have come to that pass that our two Archbishops can deliberately record the humiliating confession that "there can be no doubt that the danger we apprehend of a considerable minority both of clergy and laity amongst us desiring to subvert the principles of the Reformation is *real*," we have little cause to spend our time in saying another word to prove it. It is upon the remedy rather than the disease that our attention should be especially fixed. Suffice it, then, to say on this point that a regular organized conspiracy to unprotestantize our Church has been discovered by her loyal members, acknowledged to exist by our ecclesiastical rulers, and scarcely denied by the conspirators themselves. Not content with introducing a gorgeous ceremonial into our churches in imitation of Rome, they have now set up what is practically the Romish mass, and withal "sacramental confession" and "priestly absolution" as necessary to its right reception. "It is therefore," says Bishop Ellicott, "no use disguising the fact. What is, or rather has been, called the ritualistic movement has now passed into a distinctly counter-Reformation movement, and will, whenever sufficiently

sustained by numbers and perfected in organization, reveal its ultimate aims with clearness and decision."

Not, however, that I would for a moment forget that there are " manifold errors which assail the Truth," and which come from a totally different quarter. Infidelity in its various grades and phases, has, it may be feared, by a natural reaction, become terribly prevalent in the country. It is, indeed, deplorable to think that as the result of this Romeward movement, Rationalism is making at least as many converts as Ritualism, and, for the most part, converts of a far more educated class. If, then, I do not dwell on this form of error, it is not because I do not recognize its existence, or acknowledge its power for mischief, but because the reference to " the doctrines of our Reformed Church " which is made in the question before us leads me to suppose that I am expected to suggest the remedy for error which comes in a totally different direction.

Having, then, said this much in regard to " the errors which now assail the Truth," we pursue the inquiry as to the *remedy*, so far at least as regards the guarding our congregations against their adoption. And that question is, as we have seen, practically this:—" What course of teaching can we adopt, with the best prospect, under God, of establishing our people in the faith, fortifying them against the errors specified, and making them enlightened and spiritually minded Churchmen ? "

And to this I shall reply by offering three suggestions, only premising that though my contribution towards the solution of this painfully important question will necessarily be taken for what it is worth, and no more; yet I earnestly trust you will be assured that it is not offered without a deep sense of the grave responsibility I incur, nor without very earnest prayer for that guidance from above which can alone enable me to speak—to use the words employed in our question—" with faithfulness and soundness of judgment."

I. Let me say then, in the first place, that I think we shall all agree that our first and great want in the present crisis is a *real revival of spiritual religion in our midst*. And to secure this there is indeed but one only means to be employed with any hope of success—the plain and faithful preaching of Christ, accompanied with well sustained prayer for the Holy Ghost to apply that word of Truth. It would, indeed, be to the last degree disastrous, if we allowed any teaching whatever to interfere with the plain and practical preaching of the Gospel. Never was it more necessary than now to unfold clearly and repeatedly the great truths connected with the Fall, and the Redemption of mankind through the atoning Sacrifice and finished Righteousness of Christ. It has " pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe."

And if I were to specify any one truth which I conceive needs special prominence in our teaching in these days, I should certainly name *the renewal of the heart by the Holy Ghost*. The doctrine of the new birth is one which I fear is practically suppressed in too many of our churches. People are allowed quietly to take it for granted that they are " born again," and the congregation is regarded and addressed as though its members were all alike—real Christians.

But this delusion, however pleasing to them, and however painful to us to disturb, must be dissipated at all cost. We must plainly show, by the decisive testimony of God's word, that there is a mighty difference amongst the members of our congregations—that some are born again, and some are not—that there are the converted and the unconverted—the children of light and grace, and the servants of sin and Satan.

I would plead, therefore, for a revival of the good old Protestant and Scriptural teaching of our Fathers in Christ:—"Ye must be born again." I humbly venture to suggest that what we want is not only more teaching on the Person and work of the Holy Ghost, but also a closer application of the enquiry to the consciences of our people:—"Have you experienced this new Birth?"

We often express amazement at members of our congregations being drawn under the blighting influence of Ritualism; but if their religion is only a *profession*, and not a *reality*, what cause is there for such astonishment? If persons don't know the genuine coin of the Realm, how should we be surprised if they readily accept the counterfeit?

What then we most want, I am persuaded, is a real revival of spiritual religion in our Church. And here we must be reminded that such a revival can only originate with God—that the vital energy which we so much need to inspire both Pastors and people can only be the result of the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven.

And is not such an outpouring of the Spirit to be obtained by Prayer? Is it not promised? And would not "spiritual life be further developed in our congregations," if we could only bring them to their knees in "the present distress" and implore its fulfilment?

I believe, therefore, that no more effectual remedy for the distracted and disorganized state of our Church can be found than *a combination for prayer for the interposition of God and for the display of His Power*. With a revived Ministry and a revived Church, the clouds which at present hang so heavily over us would be rolled back, and we should speedily see the salvation of God. Oh! I will never believe that He who, at the time of the glorious Reformation, gave such courage, not only to strong men but also to feeble women, to submit to the most cruel torture and death rather than compromise the Truth, will now refuse His grace to our people, if we ask it, and enable them to stand firm to those Reformation principles thus dearly purchased. Our ecclesiastical rulers too, baptized anew with the Holy Ghost, will, at last, realize their responsibility and go boldly to the front and do their duty. "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him."

II. Let us follow this up with clear and systematic explanation of the services of our Church, showing that our *Prayer Book is Scriptural and Evangelical from cover to cover*.

Our Church refers her children to the authority of God's Word, "so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation." Art. vi.

If, therefore, we wish our people to be intelligent Churchmen, it is clear that, according to our Church's teaching, we must bring all our authorized formularies—especially that *one* around which the controversy now rages, the office of the Holy Communion—to the test of Scripture.

Let us candidly enquire, for instance, in their presence, whether we can discover, in the service I have named, the slightest support of the Ritualistic theory. Is the word "Altar" found in it? And if not, why was it excluded? Is there the slightest trace to be seen in the service of a "Propitiatory Sacrifice," or of a "Sacrificing Priest" to present it before God? Who knows anything from *the Prayer Book* of a "Real Objective Presence under the form of bread and wine" in the Lord's Supper? Nay, compare our present office with that which preceded it, and ask is not the evidence conclusive that the last Revisors took every conceivable pains to stamp out of our Prayer Book this very heresy of the Sacrifice of the Mass? Words were expunged and introduced; prayers were divided and transposed; expressions were altered and revised, and all in a Protestant direction.

This is indeed ground which has been so repeatedly gone over, that it is quite unnecessary to illustrate any further the truth of what I say; but what I would ask is this:—Can it be possible for such an enquiry as this to be pursued in detail by our people, holding the Bible in one hand and the Prayer Book in the other, without their being convinced that the teaching of our Church is both Scriptural and Protestant? With their minds thus enlightened, will they not be compelled to relegate this Ritualistic system to its own proper place? Will they not then number it, unhesitatingly, amongst certain well known dogmas which centuries ago were stigmatized by our Church as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits?"

And the benefit of such teaching would, I think, be twofold:—

First. It would arm our people against the allurements of this counter-Reformation movement. It is not, you may depend, by the mere denunciation of this heresy, however vehement and strong, that they will be deterred from exposing themselves to the evil influences of Ritualism, and so swelling the tide of defection from Protestant principles. You must enlighten their minds and show them *why it is wrong*. You must explain the real issue that is at stake. You must let men understand what "the Sacrifice of the Mass" really means, and what it involves. You must show them that "the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood" localized in the consecrated elements of bread and wine, however mystified by unintelligible explanations, is in fact, as our Rubric justly points out, *a denial of the proper humanity of Christ*. Above all, you must show them that in every church in the land where the Lord's Supper is taught to be a *Sacrifice* and not a *Sacrament*, there *the truth of Christ's finished work upon the Cross is virtually renounced*. Let the people thus see, I say, that this system is as dishonouring to God as it is subversive of the Gospel: let them only clearly understand that it was for refusing to teach this very doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice that our Reformers were bound to the stake and burnt, considering it to be a virtual denial of the sufficiency of Christ's Atonement, and then I should expect that, under

God, the plague would be stayed. Gaudy dresses, floral decorations, brilliant lights, fragrant incense, enchanting music and bannered processions may be all very dramatic and alluring to the natural heart; but to a serious and enlightened mind its attractive power would be broken directly it was discovered what it all symbolized. It would at once be regarded as a *forbidden gratification* directly it was seen that it could only be obtained at the expense of countenancing a service which was insulting to the Saviour by reason of the pretension to repeat His Sacrifice, and so casting a reflection upon the all-sufficiency of His finished work on Calvary.

Second. But the benefit of such teaching as I have named would not only be to arm our people against the allurements of Ritualism; *it would equally fortify them against being frightened by it, and so tempted to secede.* Secede! when the more carefully our formularies and services are examined, whether by lawyer or divine, the more certain we become that the teaching of our Church is in harmony with Scripture—the more confirmed we are that we ourselves are right in the interpretation we have always put on them. “We are,” says a venerable Dean, when referring to the Bennett Judgment, “in distinct, unequivocal, verbal accord with these decisions of the highest Court of Appeal, and therefore we most legitimately feel ourselves *confirmed* by this judgment as the loyal and dutiful sons of the Church of England, cordially receiving what she receives as to Presence, denying what she denies as to Sacrifice, and excluding what she excludes as to Adoration.”

And is this, let us ask, the time to talk about secession? When the ship is being scuttled, and is in danger of sinking, in God’s name let us make every effort to stop the leak; but to talk of deserting the good old ship because mutineers have been discovered on board; to think of leaving her in the hour of her peril, and that just at a time when her true Protestant colours are flying at her mast-head more conspicuous than ever, would be, to my mind at least, an act too unjustifiable and wrong even to be named, except to be reprobated by every true and loyal Churchman.

And here I hope I shall be pardoned if, before passing on to my final suggestion I venture to express my deep regret that any of our valued Brethren should press, at this critical period in the history of our Church, for a revision of our Prayer Book. This, it is sometimes said, is the only effectual remedy for the evils in our Church which we all alike deplore. I, for one, believe this to be an *entire mistake*.

We need not adopt the untenable position that our Prayer Book is a perfect book, and that no expression in it could have been more cautiously and wisely worded. Such an idea, in any human composition is, of course, simply absurd. It may also be fully admitted that there are some phrases in it which might for *convenience* sake—not, as far I am concerned, for *conscience* sake—be with advantage altered; but to press for such a revision *at this particular time* would be in point of fact to give up the whole controversy and to admit ourselves to be in the wrong. To say that the Prayer Book must needs be altered to get rid of Romanizing teachers, is to concede the point at issue, and to allow that after all they have got the teaching of our Church on their side, which is the very point I *entirely deny*.

Besides, supposing a revision were now to be attempted, are we sure that we should have it all our own way? And if not, is it not quite easy to conceive that our position in the Church of England, with a revised Prayer Book, might then become—what, thank God, it is not now—untenable!

But enough. “I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say!”

III. And here, in the third place, let me say that I think it behoves us to be, very earnest with our flocks in warning them *against giving the slightest encouragement to this movement either by their influence or example.* The best way to put out a fire is to remove all fuel that may feed it to the greatest possible distance, so that the conflagration may die out from sheer exhaustion.

It appears to me, therefore, to be a grievous mistake on the part of sound churchmen to countenance these ritualistic services by their own presence or that of their families. And yet what do we see every day? There is to my mind no more deplorable feature in this movement, than the thoughtless and even reckless way in which Protestant parents are constantly seen acting in this matter. You will hear them condemning the whole system in the most unmeasured terms one day; and then, the next, as though they were under some strange infatuation, you will see them indulging their own or their children’s curiosity by placing themselves or those children under its immediate influence.

And what is the almost certain consequence? The deadly poison, introduced into the child’s spiritual system, by the parent’s own heedlessness and folly, works its way in that system. Slowly, perhaps, but surely, it becomes developed; a taste for a gorgeous ceremonial is imbibed; outward badges are adopted and worn; the sacramental bread is received into the palm of the hand; postures and prostrations succeed; and so the plague spreads, until at last the parent stands aghast at the discovery that his child has for months been clandestinely closeted with some Anglican Priest, catechised on all the secrets of the family, and, what is worse, questioned on sin which can only with safety be breathed into the ear of God.

In the training of the young we have, indeed, every inducement to be diligent. Peculiarly susceptible to the attractions of a sensuous service; confiding and inexperienced, their danger is immense; and *so in proportion should be our efforts to keep them right.* And if, considering the ground on which I stand,* I might for a moment be allowed to refer to my own long experience with the young, I should be disposed to say that no toil, no pains, no labour in Bible, Confirmation, and Sacramental classes with the young will ever be regretted. Let them only be thoroughly grounded in the knowledge of Divine Truth, and then, under the blessing of God, they will be fortified for life against the assaults of Priest-craft. They will love their Bibles because they have discovered therein “the hid treasure.” They will love their Church, because they have ascertained that her teaching is true, and her services are spiritual and scriptural and Protestant. And then with their minds

* The Author was Incumbent of a large Parish in Wolverhampton for three and twenty years where this Address was delivered.

thus enlightened, and their hearts satisfied, you will stand on vantage ground in your effort to preserve them from being "corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." You will address them with confidence and say :—"Now you know the truth, 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.' Be not entangled in this miserable Romanizing delusion. Have nothing to do with it. Christ has far nobler employment for your talents than dressing up churches, and turning our spiritual services into musical entertainments. He who crosses the waters of the Niagara, justly thinks it wisest to give the thundering cataract below a wide berth. He will run no risk of being caught by the current, and carried down to destruction. Let the peril which we see they incur who begin by imitating the ceremonial of Rome, induce you to shew the same salutary caution :—"Touch not—taste not—handle not." "

And if it is our wisdom to warn our people to abstain from giving the slightest encouragement by word or deed to this Romanizing movement, how much more should we, as Evangelical Clergymen, be careful *lest by any indiscretion on our part, we encourage it ourselves.*

I am quite aware that I am now treading on tender ground ; and yet, I feel I should not be true to my convictions if I did not extend my word of caution to the clerical, as well as to the lay members of this Association. And what I would, with all deference, ask them is this :—If a clergyman, at this particular crisis, introduces changes into his services—except, of course, on direct authority—how can he be surprised if some members of his congregation, whose tendencies are in a Romanizing direction, clamour for more ; and then, is not the result inevitable ; if he wont give them more, they will pass over to others who will?

The question is now not unfrequently asked—How far would it be wise for us to raise our ritual to meet the prejudices of some who are in favour of a more ornate service. My own impression is that this would be only to *give an increased impetus to the Romanizing movement, and do incalculable mischief.* Better far, as it seems to me, to stand fast where we are ; only with scrupulous care let us give no just ground for complaint that ours is a cold, and dull, and slovenly service. "Let all things be done decently and in order !" We want more attraction in our churches, do you say? Granted; we do. Then here is an attractive power that will magnetize the hearts of our people, and draw them to Him who will satisfy the yearnings of the most earnest soul. Let us meet all the allurements of Ritualism by a fuller, freer, bolder preaching of the Gospel. Our desire is natural and right; we want more attraction in our churches, more success in our ministry; and here, believe me, is the secret of both. "I," says the Saviour, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

And now, one word in conclusion. Happy it is, dear friends, that whatever be the skill and subtlety with which the great enemy of God and man succeeds in sowing tares among the wheat, for the Church of Christ we have nothing to fear. Whatever may be the future of our beloved Church, as an Establishment, the Lord's people within her are safe. They shall be "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation."

And who can tell but that this resuscitated Popery, after all, will be overruled for the further development of "Spiritual Life in our Congregations?" May we not hope that it will lead God's children to examine more closely the ground on which they stand, and so induce them to cling to the Truth with a yet firmer grasp? May we not hope, in particular, that the troublous times in which we live may lead men to search more carefully the page of Prophecy; and so, reading the signs of the times, be quickened in "looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ?" And would not the effect of this on the minds of our people be salutary and good? The spread of Popery and infidelity—the increasing antagonism between light and darkness, would not stagger them. They will look for nothing else. The final development of Antichrist is only what is to be expected. "The Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith;" "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived;" "and then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming." And what if we see these signs fulfilling before our eyes? What if the impression gains ground on the minds of our people that Satan is even now marshalling his host at least for the great—the final apostacy? Will not *this*, think you, have a tendency to develop "Spiritual Life in our Congregations?" Will they not then give heed, as they never did before, to our Lord's solemn words of warning:—"Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all those things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man!"

Take, however, the most sober view you please of the political and ecclesiastical signs of the times, both at home and abroad, and the delightful conclusion we arrive at is, I think, certain and safe:—"Our redemption draweth nigh." Soon the machinery of this worn-out dispensation will stop, and the Lord will come and set all things right. In the mean season, our duty is clear. Let us be firm, patient, prayerful, and united.

"Come, my people," says God, "enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast." The last struggle, if it be sharp, will be short. "He that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." Already the rumbling of His chariot wheels may be heard in the distance by the listening ear of His loving bride. The last warning cry to a slumbering Church, it would seem, may even now be recognized above the din of strife:—"Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet Him!"

VOICES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON AURICULAR CONFESSION.

THE HOMILIES.

"Whereas the adversaries go about to wrast this place (James v. 16) for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others; for if this text ought to be understood of auricular confession, then *the Priests are as much bound to confess themselves unto the lay-people as the lay-people are bound to confess themselves to them.* And if to pray is to absolve, then *the laity by this place hath as great authority to absolve the Priests as the Priests have to absolve the laity.*

"And where that they do allege this saying of our Saviour Jesus Christ unto the leper, to prove auricular confession to stand on God's word, "*Go thy way and shew thyself to the Priest;*" do they not see that the leper was cleansed from his leprosy afore he was by Christ sent unto the Priest, for to show himself unto him? By the same reason we must be cleansed from our spiritual leprosy; I mean, our sins must be forgiven us afore we come to confession. *What need we then to tell forth our sins into the ear of the Priest, sith that they be already taken away . . .* Therefore, Holy Ambrose, in his second Sermon upon the hundred and nineteenth Psalm, doth say full well: "Go, show thyself unto the Priest: who is the true Priest but he, which is the Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech?" Whereby this holy father doth understand, that, both the priesthood and the law being changed, *we ought to acknowledge none other Priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ;* who, being our Sovereign Bishop, doth with the sacrifice of His body and blood, offered once for ever upon the altar of the cross, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins of all those that with true confession of the same do flee unto Him I do not say, but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned Curate or Pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God's word: but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the times of blindness and ignorance."—*Homilies and Canons*, pp. 576-577. S.P.C.K. Edition, 1864.

THOMAS CRANMER, *Archbishop of Canterbury*, 1533.

"And where you say, that 'by virtue of Christ's Sacrifice such as fall be relieved in the sacrament of penance,' the truth is, that such as do fall be relieved by Christ, whensoever they return to him unfeignedly with heart and mind."—*On the Lord's Supper*, p. 360. Parker Soc. Ed.

HUGH LATIMER, *Bishop of Worcester*, 1535.

"This doctrine supposes that a Pope, a priest, a finite creature, can pardon sins, whereas the Scripture holds forth *this as the prerogative only of the true God*.

"Here our papists make ado with their auricular confession, proving the same by this place. For they say Christ sent this man unto the priest to fetch there his Absolution; and therefore we must go also unto the priest, and, after confession, receive of him absolution of all our sins. But yet we must take heed, say they, that we forget nothing: for all those sins that are forgotten, may not be forgiven. And so they bind the consciences of men, persuading them that when their sins were all numbered and confessed, it was well. And hereby they took clean away the passion of Christ, for they made this numbering of sins to be a merit, and so they came to all the secrets that were in men's hearts; so that no Emperor or King could say or do, nor think anything in his heart, but they knew it; and so applied all the purposes and intents of princes to their own advantage; and this was the fruit of their auricular confession. But to speak of right and true Confession, I would to God it were kept in England, for it is a good thing. And those which find themselves grieved in conscience might go to a learned man, and there fetch of him comfort of the Word of God, and so come to a quiet conscience, which is more to be regarded than all the riches of the world."—*Sermons and Remains*, Parker Soc. Ed. pp. 179, 180.

THOMAS BECON, *Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer*, A.D. 1547.

"The Church of Christ teacheth that we ought to confess our sins to God with a penitent heart, and sure faith to obtain remission of the same for his Son Christ's sake. *The synagogue of Satan commandeth, yea, and enforceth men to make their confession to a priest . . . and to receive at his hand penance and absolution.*"—*Conf. Ep. Preface*, p. 198. Park. Soc. Edition.

"What affiance did we put in auricular confession, and in the whispering absolution of the papists, believing our sins straightways to be forgiven, if *ego absolvo* were once spoken!"—*Jewel of Joy, Preface*, p. 414.

"And by a metaphor Christ calleth the preaching of his word a Key: for as a Key hath two properties, one to shut, another to open, so hath the Word of God. It openeth to the faithful the treasure of the gifts of God,—grace, mercy, favour, remission of sins, quietness of conscience and everlasting life; but to the unfaithful it shutteth all His treasures, and suffereth them to receive none of them all, so long as they persist and remain in incredulity and unfaithfulness. These Keys are given to as many as, being truly called unto the office of ministration, preach the Word of God. They loosen, that is to say, they preach to the faithful remission

of sin by Christ. They also bind, that is, they declare to the unfaithful damnation. . . . These things have I spoken concerning the Absolution, or the Keys, which consisteth only in preaching God's Word."—*Castle of Comfort*, pp. 566-567. Parker Society Edition.

JOHN PHILPOTT, *Archdeacon of Winchester*, 1550.

"Over and besides thou affirmest then to have brought in a new way to be confessed of sins. What is this new way? To move eftsoons the people that they condemn and accuse themselves before God to beseech his forgiveness of their trespasses and wickedness. What is more old than this? What more profitable for to know the benefits of God? This confession the Fathers of the old law did use, this confession the Apostles, the Church in their times and after, did observe; but your confession is altogether new, which may be confirmed by no testimony of Holy Scripture."—*Trans. of Curio's Defence*, pp. 407, 408.

JOHN HOOPER, *Bishop of Gloucester*, 1550.

"I make no mention here of *auricular confession*, as though that were a thing necessary to be done before or after the receiving of the sacrament. For *this confession is not of God*."—*VI. Sermon on Jonas*, p. 536. Parker Society Edition.

JOHN BRADFORD, *Prebendary of St. Paul's*, 1550.

"If a man repent not until he have made confession of all his sins in the ear of his ghostly father; if a man cannot have absolution of his sins, until his sins be told by tale and number in the priest's ear . . . shall not a man by this doctrine be utterly driven from repentance."—*Sermon on Repentance*, pp. 45, 46, 47. Park. Soc. Edition.

ROGER HUTCHINSON. 1550.

"As every private man forgiveth his brother, so much more the ministers of God's word have power to do the same, for to them belongeth forgiving and retaining, binding and loosing of the whole congregation. To them Christ gave the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. How then doth God only forgive sin? Truly they are only ministers of the forgiveness, and preachers of His mercy, or of His wrath. Their forgiving and loosing is to declare the sweet and comfortable promises that are made through Jesus Christ in God's Book to such as be penitent; and their binding and retaining is to preach the law, which causeth anger to such as be impenitent. Or their loosing is to declare before the congregation, that God forgiveth the believing; and their binding is to show, that God will not pardon the unbelieving, because they are without purpose to amend and reform their livings. The common sort suppose, that God forgiveth them, as soon as the minister layeth his hands upon their heads, although they return to their old living. Be not deceived. Except thou repent, he hath no authority to forgive thee; for he is a

minister of forgiveness only to such as repent and will amend. His commission stretches no further. If thou, from the bottom of thy heart, be sorry for thy trespass, if thou be without all desire to sin, if thou earnestly mind to amend, God forgiveth thee before thou come at the minister; who first cleansed the man from leprosy, and after commanded him to show him to the priest, for a witness to the congregation. So He raised Lazarus first, and afterwards bade His disciples loose his grave bonds. As the Priest of the old law made the lepers clean or unclean, so bindeth or unbindeth, forgiveth and retaineth, curseth and blesseth, the ministers of the new Law. They put the name of God upon the people, but he only doth bless them; they minister the sacrament of forgiveness, but He only doth forgive; as St. Paul fortifieth unto the Corinthians, saying:—‘Neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God which giveth the increase.’ As an Ambassador maketh peace with a strange King, to whom he is sent with a message, but they which bear witness of the peace make it not; no more do they forgive sin, but be witness thereof, that God pardoneth them through the ambassage of Jesus Christ, who is our high Ambassador.”—*Works*, p. 96. Parker Society.

CATECHISM PUBLISHED BY ROYAL AUTHORITY IN 1553.

“To this Church belong the Keys wherewith Heaven is locked and unlocked, for that is done by the ministration of the Word, whereunto, properly appertaineth the power to bind and loose, to hold for guilty, and forgive sins. So that whosoever believeth the gospel preached in this Church, he shall be saved, but whosoever believeth not he shall be damned.”—*Liturgies of Edward*, p. 513. Parker Society.

JOHN JEWEL, *Bishop of Salisbury*, 1560.

“Moreover, we say that Christ hath given to His Ministers power to bind, to loose, to open, to shut; and that the office of loosing consisteth in this point, that the Minister should either offer by the preaching of the Gospel the merits of Christ and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent them, pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins, and hope of everlasting salvation; or else that the Minister, when any have offended their brothers’ minds with a great offence, and with a notable and open fault, whereby they have, as it were, banished and made themselves strangers from the common fellowship and from the body of Christ, then after perfite amendment of such persons, doth reconcile them and bring them home again and restore them to the company and unity of the faithful.”

“We say also, that the minister doth execute the authority of binding and shutting as often as he shutteth up the gate of the kingdom of heaven against the unbelieving and stubborn persons, denouncing unto them God’s vengeance and everlasting punishment; or else when he doth quite shut them out from the bosom of the Church by open excommunication. Out of doubt, what sentence soever the minister of God shall give in this sort, God himself doth so well allow of it, that whatsoever here in earth by their means is loosed and bound, God himself will loose and bind, and confirm the same in heaven.”

“And touching the keys, wherewith they may either shut or open the kingdom of Heaven, we, with Chrysostom, say they be ‘the knowledge of the Scriptures;’ with Tertullian, we say they be ‘the interpretation of the law;’ and, with Eusebius, we call them ‘the word of God.’”

"Moreover that Christ's disciples did receive this authority, not that they should hear private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings, as the common massing priests do everywhere now-a-days, and do it so as though in that one point lay all the virtue and use of the keys, but to the end they should go, they should teach, they should publish abroad the Gospel, and be unto the believing the sweet savour of life unto life, and unto the unbelieving and unfaithful a savour of death unto death."—*Apology*, vol. iii. pp. 60, 61. Parker Soc. Edition.

"This is the confession that St. Augustine speaketh of; *not secret, or private, or in the ear; but public, and open, and in the thought and hearing of all the people.* In like manner saith St. Ambrose: 'Thou must needs humble thyself, and desire many to entreat for thee. Let the Church thy mother weep for thee, and let her wash thy offence with her tears.' This therefore was no plain dealing, with such sleight to turn public into private, and the open audience of the whole people into only one man's secret ear; and so much to abuse the simplicity of your reader. Certainly these words of Saint Augustinè, 'open penance,' 'confess openly,' 'in the sight of all the people;' 'that the whole Church may pray for thee;' *these words, I say, will not easily serve to prove your purpose for private confession.*"—*Jewel's Works*, vol. iii. Parker Soc. Ed.

JOHN PILKINGTON, *Bishop of Durham*, 1561.

"Socrates, lib. V. cap. xix. and Sozomen, lib. VII. cap. xvi. in their ecclesiastical histories write and teach, that shriving to a priest was not commanded by God, but invented by man; and therefore, when they see it abused, they took it away, and used it not any more. . . . Then, if confession might be taken away, as here appears it was, it is not so necessary to salvation: nor the universal church has used it ever, as he says, nor we disobey not the church in leaving it off, seeing so many holy men have done it before us."—*The Burning of St. Paul's*, S. vii. pp. 553, 554. Park Soc. Edition.

THOMAS ROGERS, *Chaplain to Archbp. Bancroft*, 1580.

"The consideration hereof (that is, of the character of penance, as it had been taught up to that time) hath moved, besides the Church of England, all other churches reformed, to shew their detestation of this new Sacrament, as having no warrant from God's word."

"The blasphemies are outrageous, and the errors many and monstrous comprised in this doctrine of popish penance. For neither can the matter of this their sacrament, nor the form, nor the minister, nor the effect, be drawn from the word of God. They say penance is a sacrament, and yet can they shew no element it hath to make it a sacrament."

"To confess all sins, and that one after another with all circumstances unto a priest, as it is impossible, so is it never enjoined by God, nor hath ever been practised by any of God's saints."

"An untruth is it, that any priest, bishop, or pope, hath power at his will to forgive sins, or can enjoin any punishment that can make an amends unto God for the least offence."—*On Article XXV.*, p. 257. Parker Society Edition.

WILLIAM FULKE, *Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, 1580.*

"The tenth Difference is of Confession and Penance; in which he maketh two kinds, open Confession and private. For the open Confession, used in the primitive Church, he bringeth many proofs out of Acts xix, Augustin, Tertullian, Cyprian, the Council of Nice, which need not; for we grant that it was used, and we ourselves, according to such discipline as our Church of England hath, do use it; that public and notorious offenders make public Confession of their faults for satisfaction of the congregation. But when this public Confession was abused, he saith, that this practice of the Church, and the counsel of St. James, willing Christians to confess one before another, was restrained to the auricular confession of the Priest only. But neither he sheweth when, nor by what authority the counsel of the Apostle and practice of the Church was thus altered."—*Stapleton's Fortress overthrown*, pp. 89-90. Park. Soc. Edition.

RICHARD HOOKER, *Master of the Temple, 1585.*

"They are men that would seem to honour antiquity, and none more to depend upon the reverend judgment thereof. I dare boldly affirm that for many hundred years after Christ, the Fathers held no such opinion; they did not gather by our Saviour's words any such necessity of seeking the priest's absolution from sin, by secret and (as they now term it) sacramental confession: public confession they thought necessary by way of discipline, not private confession, as in the nature of a sacrament, necessary."—*Hooker's Works*, Bk. 6, Ch. 4, Sec. 6.

"It is not to be marvelled that so great a difference appeareth between the doctrine of Rome and ours, when we teach repentance. They imply in the name of repentance much more than we do. We stand chiefly upon the true inward conversion of the heart; they more upon works of external show. We teach, above all things, that repentance which is one and the same from the beginning to the world's end; they have a sacramental penance of their own devising and shaping. We labour to instruct men in such sort, that every soul, which is wounded with sin, may learn the way how to cure itself; they, clean contrary, would make oldsores seem incurable, unless the priest have a hand in them."—*Hooker's Works*, Bk. 6, Ch. 6, Sec. 2.

JOSEPH HALL, *Bishop of Norwich, 1641.*

"A religion that racks the conscience with the needless torture of a necessary shrift, wherein the virtue of absolution depends on the fulness of confession; and that, upon examination: and the sufficiency of examination, is so full of scruples, besides those infinite cases of unresolved doubts in this feigned penance, that the poor soul never knows when it is clear."—*Diss. against Popery*, pp. 18, 19, Vol. ix. London, 1808.

"That there is a lawful, commendable, beneficial use of Confession, was never denied by us; but to set men upon the rack, and to strain their souls up to a double pin of absolute necessity (both *precepti* and *medii*); and of a strict particularity, and that by a screw of *Jus Divinum*, 'God's law,' is so mere a Roman Novelty, that many ingenious authors of their own have willingly confessed it."—*The Old Religion*, Vol. ix. p. 274. London, 1808.

JOHN GOODMAN, *Archdeacon of Middlesex*, 1648.

"Indeed she (the Church of England) hath not set up a confessor's chair in every parish, nor much less placed the priest in the seat of God Almighty, as thinking it safer, at least in ordinary cases, to remit men to the text of the written word of God, and to the public ministry thereof, for resolution of conscience, than to the secret oracle of a priest in a corner, and advises them rather to observe what God himself declares of the nature and guilt of sin, the aggravations or abatements of it, and the terms and conditions of pardon, than what a priest pronounces."—*Dis. on Aur. Conf. Gib. Pres.* Vol. x. p. 163.

JEREMY TAYLOR, *Bishop of Down and Connor*, 1660.

"But concerning confession as it is a special act of repentance, the first thing that is to be said of it, is that it is due only to God."—*Of Ecclesiastical Penance. Works*, cap. x. s. iv. p. 440, vol. vii. Lond. 1850.

"That confession to a priest is a doctrine taught as necessary in the Church of Rome, is without all question; and yet, that it is but the commandment of men, I shall (I hope) clearly enough evince."—*Dissuasive of Popery*, vol. vi. p. 503.

". . . . And supposing both the premises true that Christ had made them judges, and that without particular cognizance they could not give judgment according to Christ's intention; yet it follows not that therefore it is necessary that the penitent shall confess all his sins to the priest."—p. 508.

"The question then is, whether to confess all our greater sins to a priest, all that upon strict enquiry we can remember, be necessary to salvation? This the Church of Rome now affirms; and this the Church of England, and all Protestant churches, deny; and complain sadly that the commandments of men are changed into the doctrines of God, by a pharisaical empire and superstition."—*Auricular Conf.*, vol. vi. pp. 504, 505.

"But to clear the whole question, I shall first prove that *the necessity of confessing our sins to a priest is not found in Scripture*, but very much to disprove it; secondly, that there is no reason enforcing this necessity, but very much against it; thirdly, that there is no ecclesiastical tradition of any such necessity, but apparently the contrary; and the consequent of these things will be that the Church of Rome hath introduced a *new doctrine, false and burdensome, dangerous and superstitious*."—pp. 506, 507.

". . . . But when it (the old ecclesiastical discipline) had degenerated into little forms, and yet was found to serve great ends of power, wealth and ambition, it passed into new doctrines, and is now bold to pretend to divine institution, though it be nothing but the commandment of men, a snare of consciences, and a ministry of human policy; false in the proposition, and intolerable in the conclusion."—pp. 533, 534.

JOHN BRAMHALL, *Archbishop of Armagh*, 1660.

" . . . I will shew him what we dislike. First in their doctrine—1. That a private, particular, and plenary enumeration of all sins is instituted by Christ, and absolutely necessary to salvation."—*Prot. Ordination*, Vol. v. part iv. p. 190. Oxf. 1845.

GILBERT BURNET, *Bishop of Salisbury*, 1689.

"It is enough for the present purpose to shew, that it (auricular confession) is no law of God; upon which we do also see very good reason why it ought not to be made a law of the Church; both because it is beyond their authority, which can only go to matters of order and of discipline, as also because of the vast inconveniences that are likely to arise out of it."—*On Article XXV.* p. 370. Oxford, 1831.

JOHN TILLOTSON, *Archbishop of Canterbury*, 1691.

"But because the necessity of confessing our Sins to Men (that is to the priest), in order to the forgiveness of them, is a great point of difference between us and the Church of Rome, it being by them esteemed a necessary Article of Faith, but by us, so far from being necessary to be believed, that we do not believe it to be true."—*Sermon cvi. Works*, vol. ii. p. 8. London, 1712.

"To what end is Auricular Confession but to keep people in awe by the knowledge of their secrets."—*Sermon lxxv.* p. 484, vol. ii.

JOHN SHARP, *Archbishop of York*, 1691.

"Could they produce but one text of the Bible to prove this Auricular Sacramental Confession of Sins to a Priest was recommended by our Lord or his Apostles, or that it was practised by any Christian, either of the clergy or laity, or so much as mentioned by the holy men of that time, something might be said. But this they cannot do, and therefore to impose their doctrine on all the Christian world is most intolerable."—*Dis. on Prov. xxviii. 13. Rat. Def. Dis. xviii.* p. 249.

WILLIAM LLOYD, *Bishop of Worcester*, 1699.

"For Confession to a Priest, the necessity of it was unknown to the Fathers of the Primitive Church. Nay, above a thousand years after Christ, it was held disputable in the Roman Church."—*Sermon on Acts ii. 42. Gibs. Pres. vol. 12.* p. 15.

* * NOTE.—The Italics are ours.

See also *Leaflet 14. Utterances of the Episcopal Bench on Confession.*

CONFESSION AND FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BARDSLEY, M.A.,
RECTOR OF STEPNEY.

THE following *brief* remarks are intended to indicate what we believe to be the doctrine of the Word of God, and the Teaching of the Church of England, on Confession and Forgiveness of Sins, with special reference to the office of Christian Ministers.

We begin, as our Church would have us in all such inquiries, by ascertaining what God has said in His Word, that we may judge the Church by the Bible, and not the Bible by the Church, being fully convinced that, "as many as may be desirous to enter into the right and perfect way unto God, must apply their minds to know Holy Scripture; without the which they can neither sufficiently know God and His will, neither their office and duty;" and that "Ignorance of God's word is the cause of all error."*

We believe that no truth is more frequently and distinctly set forth in the Bible, than that through Christ's atoning merits and perfect righteousness, there is free, full and complete forgiveness offered and granted to all that truly repent and believe. Whether we turn to the pages of the Old Testament or New, we encounter but one difficulty, viz., to select passages from the mass of evidence which lies before us. The Old Testament abounds with such declarations as the following, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins." "Who is a God like unto

* Homily on "The Reading and Knowledge of Holy Scripture."

■

thee, that pardoneth iniquity and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? . . . Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." In these and similar passages there is not so much as a hint given that the forgiveness promised is made to depend upon confession to a priest, or that God had ordained some special authorized channel through which the absolving grace was to flow. But though we do not find a hint of this kind dropped from Genesis to Malachi, we do find the blessing of pardon offered to all who repent and confess their sins unto God. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon." Words cannot be more definite than those of David, "I acknowledged my sins unto Thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin."

We believe, to use the language of Archbishop Usher, whom the University of Oxford pronounced to be "The unanswerable defender of the Orthodox Religion," that "in Scripture we find that the confession which the penitent sinner maketh to God alone, hath the promise of forgiveness annexed unto it, which no priest upon earth hath power to make void upon pretence that himself, or some of his fellows, were not first particularly acquainted with the business."

We cannot, for a moment, entertain the belief, except upon the most explicit testimony, that the privilege of direct access and communion with our Heavenly Father, accorded to the saints under the Old Testament dispensation, is denied his adopted children, under the brighter and better dispensation of the Gospel. Whilst the New Testament abounds with promises of pardon to the contrite suppliant, we know but of one passage, (John xx. 23) and that only when considered apart from the rest, which gives any countenance to the theory, "that our Lord Jesus Christ has instituted in His Church a special means for the remission of sin after Baptism," and that any other way is "extramedial, exceptional and abnormal." We are fully convinced that the words of our Saviour to his disciples will not sustain this doctrine, if we accept for our guidance the sound canon of interpretation laid down in our 20th Article, viz., that "it is not lawful . . . so to expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another."

After the Resurrection, the Apostles and other disciples being assembled together, Jesus "breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained." In these words the Apostles received a commission which would affect their daily ministrations.

In the Acts of the Apostles we have a record of their labours and teaching; and we have the Epistles which were specially designed to promote our communion with God and growth in grace. Looking over these records to find out what the Apostles did and said, we shall get much light to help us to the right understanding of these words. But we may first, with advantage, compare the words by

St. John, with the terms of our Lord's commission, as given by St. Mark, and His declaration by St. Luke. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved : but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 15.) "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke xxiv. 47.)

We believe that St. Peter carried out our Saviour's commission, when on the day of Pentecost he commanded his hearers (Acts ii. 38) "to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins ;" and again, when he addressed the Jewish elders, "Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." Similarly, when he preached to the assembly in the house of Cornelius, telling them that "to Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins."

What can be more explicit than the words of St. Paul at Antioch, (Acts xiii. 38,) "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins ; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

It would be easy to multiply such passages from the Acts of the Apostles ; but to whatever portion of the New Testament we look, we learn that the substance of what the Apostles preached and taught was, "Repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." The practice of the Apostles must be regarded as a comment upon the words of our Lord. These words cannot, and are not, taken in their literal sense by any one. If the Apostles understood our Saviour to invest them with the power of conveying the pardon of sin as committed against God in any other sense than by proclaiming the terms on which God will forgive, we have no record that in a single instance they ever obeyed ; but on the other hand, if their commission required them, as ambassadors of Christ, to beseech men to be reconciled unto God, telling them "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," and that forgiveness is granted to all who repent and believe—then, in every recorded act of their ministry, they carried out their Saviour's command. Without repentance and faith no one professes that Christ gave the Apostles power to forgive men their sins ; but the Apostles themselves constantly declare that God Himself forgives all who turn to Him with penitence and faith. Therefore, nothing can remain for His ministers to do but to make known to men the terms upon which God graciously pardons sinners.*

* "Christ's disciples did receive this authority, not that they should hear private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings, as the common massing priests do everywhere now-a-days, and do it so, as though in that one point lay all the virtue and use of the keys ; but to the end they should go, they

We are convinced that the following statements cannot be successfully controverted:—

1. That in the Bible there is no command given to men to confess their sins to a priest under the law, or to a minister under the Gospel.
2. That there is no case recorded of any such confession being made.
3. That we nowhere read in Scripture of sin against God, being forgiven by a priest or minister.
4. That the Bible abounds with promises of free and full forgiveness to all who feel the remembrance of their sins to be grievous unto them and the burden intolerable.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

As members of the Protestant Reformed Church of this land, we sincerely rejoice in the conviction, that her Formularies, without resorting to evasive and non-natural interpretation, cannot be strained into affording any justification for the practice of Sacramental Confession and Absolution.

In the Ordination Service the ministers receive their commission in these words:—"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands, whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy Sacraments, &c." As this commission, so far as regards the forgiveness of sins, is couched in the words of our blessed Lord to His Apostles, we can only learn from those portions of our Formularies which bear upon the subject, the meaning our Church would have us attach to them. But before proceeding to do this we may remark, that Thomas Becon, chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, and Editor of the first Book of Homilies; Archbishop Whitgift,* who wrote his book in reply to Cartwright, at the request of Archbishop Parker, and is described by Strype as "one of the public books of the Church of England;" Bishop Jewel, whose Apology received the sanction of Convocation in 1562; and Richard Hooker; maintained that the words of our Saviour only invested the first disciples, and since then, all

should teach, they should publish abroad the Gospel, and be unto the believing a sweet savour of life unto life, and unto the unbelieving and unfaithful a savour of death unto death."—*Bishop Jewel's Apology, Parker Society Ed.* p. 61.

* "The Bishop, by speaking these words, doth not take upon him to give the Holy Ghost, no more than he doth to remit sins, when he pronounceth the remission of sins; but by speaking these words of Christ, 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted, &c.,' he doth show the principal duty of a minister, and assureth him of the assistance of God's Holy Spirit: if he labour in the same accordingly."—*Whitgift, Vol. i., p. 489. Parker Society Edition.*

faithful ministers of Christ's religion, with the authority to declare free remission of sins to the truly penitent, or on behalf of the Church to impose and relax Church censures; and that in all they have written they always assume that this is the teaching of the Church of England as against the Church of Rome, which claims for her priests the power of a judicial Absolution.

There are three forms of Absolution in our Prayer Book.

1. The form of Absolution read in our daily service is strictly *declaratory and conditional*. It ascribes forgiveness to God; and the *declaration* of forgiveness to His ministers. No declaration can make a thing to be what it was not previously; but it assumes the thing to be what it is declared to be. We have here a clear definition of the province of ministers in reference to the forgiveness of men's sins. Whilst God "pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel," His ministers are commissioned "to *declare* and *pronounce* to His people being penitent the Absolution and remission of their sins." Our Church in this form has limited, and clearly defined the limitation of the power with which she invested her ministers at the time of their Ordination.*

2. The second form of Absolution, which occurs in the Communion Service consists of two parts, the first a declaration that "our heavenly Father" "hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto Him;" the second a prayer that God will grant pardon to those who have just confessed their sins unto Him.

3. The third form is in the service for the Visitation of the Sick, and reads thus: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church, to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "Possibly," says Bishop Mant, "this part of the office may still seem to have ascribed so high a power to the minister, of absolving the sick from their sins, as may lead them into great mistakes. And it is, indeed, more liable to be so misunderstood, than the earlier forms, which were expressed in the manner of a prayer. But still all writers on the subject have agreed that this absolution either was intended, which is indeed most probable, only to set persons free from any ecclesiastical censures, which they might have incurred, . . . or, if it means also to declare them restored to the favour of God, means it only on supposition of a sincere and thorough repentance."†

* "Doth it (Absolution) really take away sin, or but ascertain us of God's most gracious and merciful pardon? The latter of which two is our assertion; the former theirs."—*Hooker*. Book vi. Ch. vi. 4.

And again he says:—

"As for the ministerial sentence of private Absolution, it can be no more than a declaration of what God hath done; it hath but the force of the prophet Nathan's absolution, 'God hath taken away thy sin.'"—Book vi. Ch. vi. 8.

† Mant on the Book of Common Prayer.

Either of the two interpretations indicated by Bishop Mant is in harmony with all the Church has said on absolution; but the modern interpretation of the Ritualistic school, viz. that the absolution is judicial, is utterly inconsistent with her teaching.

Such a view contradicts the prayer which immediately follows the absolution, where the minister prays—“*Open thine eye of mercy upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth pardon and forgiveness;*” and again he prays, “*Impute not unto him his former sins.*” If the minister’s absolution had actually conveyed pardon to the heart of the sick person, why should both the minister and the sick man still pray that God will pardon his past offences?

On the supposition that the former part of the absolution, which is a prayer to Christ that He will *forgive*, refers to sins committed against God; and that the second part, where the minister is said to *absolve*, refers to sins as scandals committed against the Church, the Absolution and the whole service are in perfect harmony.

To interpret the words in the sense of conveying a judicial absolution, flatly contradicts the plain words of the Homily on Repentance, which assures us that if we are truly penitent we need not “tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest, since they be already taken away;” and that “we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins, but our Saviour Jesus Christ.”

With regard to Private Confession, to use the words of Mr. Burgon, a well-known and learned “High Churchman,” we believe that “It must be plain to any man of common sense and honesty, that to the whole system of auricular confession, whether constant or periodical, the Church of England stands utterly opposed.”

The Church in her Communion office recommends those who desiring to come to the Holy Communion, but cannot by prayerful self-examination (the ordinary way recommended by the Church) quiet their own conscience, and desire further comfort or counsel, to go to “some discreet and learned minister of God’s Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God’s Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice.” There is not a word here about auricular confession or a *formal* absolution. A contrite soul in trouble and perplexity is exhorted “to open his grief”—not to confess his sins—to a “discreet and learned minister of God’s word,” that he may receive, by the ministry of the same word, the benefit of absolution: that is, that he may obtain peace and comfort for his troubled conscience, by a learned minister’s judicious application of some of those “exceeding great and precious promises” contained in God’s Holy Word. In the Prayer Book of 1549, the troubled in conscience was “to receive absolution from the ministers of God and the Church;” but by the book of 1552, it is the benefit of absolution by the ministry of God’s Word; and at a subsequent revision the word “Holy” was added, thereby placing it, we should have thought, beyond the ingenuity of man, to contend that the words could refer to some formal absolution, when it is distinctly declared that the benefit to be looked for is from the ministry of God’s Holy Word.

It is undeniable that by the changes made in our Liturgy, the Reformers were charged by the Romanists, at the time these changes took place, with having abolished Auricular Confession; also that the Reformers acknowledged the correctness of the charge, but defended what they had done by an appeal to the practice of the early Church.—(*Bishop Pilkington's Works, Parker Society Edition*, p. 554.) It is a matter of fact, with these changes in our Liturgy, Confessional boxes disappeared from our churches, and have been unknown in the English Church since the Reformation until within the last few years; and they were removed because the system of the Confessional had been abolished.

The Service for the Visitation of the Sick is the only place in the Prayer Book where confession to a minister is mentioned, and even there the minister is only to recommend it when he finds "the conscience is troubled with some weighty matter," from which it clearly follows that it was the intention of the Church to limit the inquiry and the confession to that one thing which was the cause of the sick person's trouble or distress. Besides there is not one word to indicate that the confession must of necessity be made secretly, as the service assumes the presence of relatives or friends. Here is confession, but the circumstances are so special and exceptional, that they constitute a strong protest against the doctrine of Auricular Confession as defined and practised by Romanists and Ritualists. The following passage by Bishop Phillpotts, the late Bishop of Exeter, must commend itself to unbiassed and impartial men:—"So little is our Church inclined to encourage its ministers to pry into the secrets of their penitents, that it enjoins every other step to be previously taken before the last measure of particular confession be proposed . . . and if from the sick man's answers to his inquiries, the minister find him in a state of penitence and peace, *his business is completed: he is not authorized—he is by implication forbidden—to move him to any further disclosure.*"

We are unable to believe that a Church can justly be charged with sanctioning Auricular Confession which has clearly and distinctly declared—

1. That Auricular Confession hath not the warrant of God.
2. That justifies its abolition, by Nectarius Bishop of Constanti-nople, when abused by man's lewdness, on the ground that it had not been ordained of God.
3. That quotes Augustine to show the absurdity of the practice.
4. That characterizes it as a thing belonging to the time of blindness and ignorance.
5. That charges the adversaries with shamefully deceiving the people, and wresting the Scriptures in order to prove Auricular Confession to stand on God's Word.
6. And that assures penitents that they have no need to tell their sins into the ear of a priest seeing they be already taken away;

and that we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

The more strictly and rigidly men enquire into the exact meaning of those passages in our Church's formularies, which bear upon this subject, the more strongly, we are persuaded, will they be convinced, that our Church discountenances the practice of auricular confession; and that the whole spirit of her teaching is directly opposed to the doctrine of judicial absolution by a priest. Our Church does indeed recommend for a doubting and troubled believer the unburdening of his mind to his spiritual pastor, that he may receive counsel and consolation to the quieting of his conscience, by the ministry of God's Holy Word.

While therefore we recognize humble and heartfelt confession of our sins to God as an essential part of Christian worship, and hail with thankfulness the declaration of our ministers that Almighty God pardons and absolves all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel, and while we rejoice in the privilege of consulting discreet and learned ministers of His Word concerning what may at any time perplex our minds and wound our consciences; we are at the same time fully convinced that Auricular Confession, as practised in this country previous to the Reformation, or as recently revived in our midst, has no real foundation, either in the Word of God or in the formularies of the Church of England; and that in proportion as it prevails, it is injurious to the best interests of individual souls and disastrous to the peace of our homes.

* Homily "Of Repentance and true Reconciliation unto God."

WHAT MEAN YE BY THIS SERVICE?

By the Author of "Watchman, what of the night?"

WHAT MEAN YE BY THIS SERVICE? Why are there so many changes now in the services of our Church? And why is there all this stir about them? What harm is there in them? Why do some people like to see the Communion Table handsomely decorated, while others are grieved, and go in all weathers to distant churches to avoid it? Why do they leave for such trifles? Why do they look serious and sad, as if something dreadful had happened, only because some new colour has been introduced, or candlesticks or crosses or flowers have been placed on the Communion Table? Why are such trifles a cause of sorrow? And if these little matters make so many people sorrowful, why do these clergymen insist on having them, and allow their people to go to other churches rather than give them up? Surely, surely, there must be some deep meaning in all these things, if they cause so much pain and dissension.

Will those, who know the meaning of these things, tell us who do not know it? And so plainly that we may understand and see, if it is right for us to join in that, which others so earnestly reject.

Dear friends, we would gladly answer your questions, but to do so as plainly as you require is not so easy, for those things which perplex you refer to past history, and with this from your questions we must conclude you are not acquainted. There have been many able works written on these subjects for the learned, but few for you who ask to have them made very plain. So these simple words are only for those who say they know nothing about history.

All your questions refer to errors, that have come by degrees into the Church—meaning thereby the visible earthly Church established by our Lord and His Apostles. And these errors so increased as time went on that they became unbearable: and about 300 years ago we threw them off, though not without a fearful conflict, when devoted servants of the Lord laid down their lives amid fire and sword; when rivers of blood flowed, and the slain for the truth were many. But at last the victory was won, the hated errors were cast out, we got the power to *protest* against them, and thus obtained

our honoured name of PROTESTANTS or protesting ones, which we now bear as protesting against those errors. And thus the Church was reformed, and the time of that reforming we call THE REFORMATION.

All the things you mention as trifles are just so many signs of a gradual bringing back of those very errors, which these Saints of the Lord died by burning to cast out. Think you then that they are such trifles as they appear? Will men be willingly roasted slowly to death for a trifle? Nay, all these things were solemn realities to those who laid down their lives for the truth. And the more we understand the meaning of these seeming trifles, and hate the errors to which they lead, the more we reverence the memory of those who died to resist them; and the more grieved we feel to see those very errors, which cost the blood of thousands, coming back into our beloved Church.

It would be impossible in a small paper like this to give the meaning of all these *seeming* trifles,—it would take volumes to do so properly,—we can therefore only warn you to see for yourselves to what they lead.

Suppose you are going on a long journey to a place to which you have never been, will you not examine each sign post as you go along to see if you are on the right road? And supposing you come to one which shows you, that you are on the wrong road, will you go on, hoping that for all that you will still somehow or other come right at the end? or will you not *at once* turn off that road, and seek until you find the right one? Again, what is a sign post? some wood and a little paint—that is all, trifling enough, but how important to the traveller! And what traveller would be so taken up with the wood and painting of the sign board as not to regard that which is written on it? Then let us, who are all indeed on a journey to a place from whence none return, carefully examine these sign boards set up before us on our way, and see what they tell us. Thank God we have got a Guide Book by us to which we can all refer to find the way, and the wayfaring man though a fool need not err therein.

And with God's help, without bitterness towards those who set up the sign posts on our road, let us see where they would lead us to; and if they are our appointed teachers, let us, like the noble Bereans, search the Scriptures to see if the things they teach us be true. Surely if any teacher taught without error, it was the divinely appointed St. Paul; and yet the Holy Spirit commends the people of Berea because they examined the Scriptures to see if that, which he taught, was in accordance with them; and we read, "Therefore many of them believed." (Acts xvii. 11, 12.)

Yet, strange to say, with that commendation before us as an example for ourselves, we feel as if it were almost presumption to treat our teachers as the Holy Spirit teaches us was right to do in the case of St. Paul; and some of our Pastors seem to think, we should consider them as even to be more trusted than St. Paul

himself, and that all they teach should be received without any question or doubt whatever.

So that, while fearing the charge of presumption, we have fallen into the greater evil of indolence. And you, dear reader, may have had it said to you, "Will you say that you may examine into my teaching to see if I am right, when my knowledge of the Scriptures must be so much greater than yours; while I have studied it in Greek and have had a University education?" All this sounds well; but turn to the Scriptures like the noble Bereans, and you will see that when the only faultless Teacher, the Head of the Church Himself, was on earth the Pharisees, who knew the Scriptures well, boasted, "Have any of the Rulers or the Pharisees believed on Him?" (John vii. 47-49.) Then turn to another Scripture and read, "And the common people heard Him gladly." (Mark xii. 37.) Now we know who were the wise ones. Are you among the common people? Then be not alarmed at a want of knowledge of the Greek Bible. You will not be judged by the Greek or Hebrew Scriptures, but by the plain English. "My son, give me thine heart," is as plain to understand in English, as if you could translate it from many different languages. Then as for the University education. Alas, alas, so many have come out of our Universities even denying the truth of God's holy word, that we have almost more reason to fear such teaching than to trust it. Then they will tell you, "Hear the Church, we are the voice of the Church." But the voice of what Church? Let us take any two hundred of the clergy of the Church of England, and probably half of them would be shocked to receive or follow the views of the other half, and yet which of them are we to hear? Both say, "We have the truth; follow us; *we* are the voice of the Church;" and yet their teachings are as far one from the other as light from darkness. We cannot therefore believe both; and all this often leads to believing neither, because we do not search the Scriptures for ourselves to find what the teaching of the Lord Himself is. Surely this is not dealing fairly either with our Pastors or our own souls. The true and faithful Pastor will not fear your examining his teaching by the light of Scripture, which "giveth light and understanding unto the simple." (Ps. cxix.) Let us then no longer dare to call that presumption which the Holy Spirit commends as noble.

When we see these changes in the services of our Church, let us bring them to the full light of Scripture, and we shall soon see they are but so many sign posts bearing the sadly solemn but plain words, 'TO ROME.'

But some will say, what does "To Rome" mean? and why are some of our clergy so anxious to take us there? Here we come to History, but of course we can only refer to facts, which may be found fully proved elsewhere.

We would first of all specially bring before you that, which may be called the foundation error of the Church of Rome. It has a long name and is called TRANSUBSTANTIATION, and it came

into the Church like all other errors *by degrees*. For the first few hundred years after Christ, this doctrine was unknown in the Church, then it came in here and there. Its first principal teachers were two men called Damascene and Amellarius about 700 years after Christ; but it was not generally held until the year 1551, when, at a great Council of the Church it was decreed to be an article of faith, which all must hold; and more blood has been shed to make men submit to this one error than to all the other errors of Rome put together. The doctrine itself may be stated in a few words, *viz.* That when our Lord instituted the Holy Communion to be taken in remembrance of His death until He comes again, and said the words, "This is my body," He meant His real body of flesh; and when He said, "This is my blood," He meant the real blood that was in His veins. This is the doctrine as the Roman Catholics state it themselves, but—what is still more wonderful—they declare that, when any priest consecrates the bread and wine for Communion as he says the words, "This is my body," the bread then turns into the real body of the Lord, and at the words "This is my blood" the wine is changed into the real blood of the Lord! Nay, they even go further than this, and declare that they change the bread into all the true parts of a body as bones and nerves, and that not only is the flesh there but the soul and Divinity of the Lord Jesus; and also that every time the priest pronounces these words and transforms the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of our Lord, that is the sacrifice of the Mass, which they tell us is just as much a real sacrifice, as when the Lord was crucified on the cross. Again at what they call the "Supreme Moment" of consecration all present are to devoutly kneel, bells are rung, candles are lighted, incense is swung, &c., and then the priest lifts the bread high up for all to worship it, just as if it were the Lord Himself. Then the priest—as he cannot turn his back on the place, where he holds that the body of the Lord is laid—must needs stand with his back to the people. And as they hold that this service is a real sacrifice, the table on which it is offered they call an *altar*, the meaning of the word altar being, that whereon sacrifices are offered. They also use special colours on special occasions, such as white on the feasts of the Lord, the Virgin Mary, Saints and Angels; purple in Lent and Advent; red at Whitsuntide; black on Good Friday; and green on all common days. They also decorate the table, some putting candlesticks, crosses, and fresh flowers, others adding gold, jewels, lace, pictures and many other things, but all for the same object, to do honour to the place, where they say the body of the Lord is or has at any time been placed.

Now while we feel that there is nothing in earth or heaven itself good enough to adorn the place on which the body of the Lord could be laid, we do not believe, that any man has the power to bring down the body of the Lord from Heaven, his dwelling-place, to this lower world. And here is the point on which we Protestants strongly *protest* against this doctrine of Rome. The question is not, whether we object to decorate the communion-table, but whether we will con-

sent to decorate it for the reception of the Lord's body ; for we Protestants hold, that no change at all takes place in the bread and wine, and that the bread is bread, and the wine is wine just as much after consecration as before. At the same time we admit that the consecrating them has set them aside for a most holy purpose, and that therefore they are to be treated with the utmost reverence and to be used only for the purpose, for which they have been consecrated, that is, to be partaken of by those who seek to be benefited by their dear Lord's death and passion ; who then feed on the Lord in their heart by faith with thanksgiving ; and while they are showing forth the Lord's death till He come, they do it according to His command and in remembrance of Him. Such are the opposite views that the Church of Rome and the Church of England severally hold on this doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and Protestants may well feel pained to see the errors of Rome brought back to us, after all it cost to cast them off.

Thus we perceive the necessity of looking out for sign posts in our way, and the first glance at the communion table will show the teaching we may in due time expect in the pulpit. For after our minds have become accustomed to the sight of the communion table decorated for some special purpose, we are prepared to hear that the preacher can indeed bring the body of our Lord on to the table thus adorned to receive Him.

Shall we then put up with this delusion ? Shall we sit quietly by and not care to see that very error taught, which Bishops Hooper, Latimer, Ridley, and other saints died by cruel deaths rather than consent to ?

Wake up for God's sake before it is too late, and read those sign boards set before your very eyes. Do not be so taken up gazing at the pretty painting of the sign board as not to notice that which it shows you. Do you see beautiful flowers or different colours, or candlesticks on the communion table ? For what are they there ? Read, "*To Rome*," as plain as any sign post can show. Does the clergyman bow to the table, even though there be nothing on it ? To what can he be bowing, unless he thinks the body of the Lord has been at some time there ? See in this "*To Rome*" marked plainer still. And when the bread and wine is consecrated, does he fold his hands and bow his head before it, putting on a look for the time as if he was looking at the murdered body of the Lord ? *To Rome, to Rome*, all this acting leads most surely.

But will you still, my friend, go on the road you know to be wrong, not only encouraging your pastor to continue in his delusion, but aiding to bring others with you ; for there is not one, who persists in going on a wrong road, but helps forward others also younger and weaker than himself.

We will not dwell on the pollutions and corruptions of the Church of Rome to which you are thus encouraging others to come ; we would have you read for yourselves the xvith and xviith chapters of the Revelations, in which that false church is at one time described

as a wicked "woman," and at another as a "great city:" in both cases as being only for a time in great pomp and splendour, having great authority and power of persecuting, but afterwards ending in a fearful overthrow.

Can we read this, and make no effort to guard others against such an evil? We all have more or less influence on those around us; especially on the young and thoughtless, whom the errors of Rome are particularly calculated to attract; for while allowing them to enjoy all its outward show, that church does not demand of them that separation from worldly pleasures, or that surrender of their hearts entirely to God, which they are not ready to yield. They are quite ready to decorate a communion table, but will *not* give up the worldly amusement of a dance or of the theatre. They may wear a cross as a toy, but to take it up as the Lord commands by going against the world and its ways, bearing His reproach by being avoided by those who love the world—perhaps laughed at for being religious—this they are not willing to do. For they know nothing of the entrancing joys of following the Lord, the intense happiness of having the Lord ever near them as their friend, their help, their daily joy, and comfort. Oh! then let us draw these dear young people from all that false teaching, which, in the midst of their alluring worldly enjoyments, would keep them satisfied with an outward service only. And even for those, to whom dancing and theatres and such things are no pleasure, the world may be in other ways just as absorbing. Their affections may be so fully set on the things of this life, that they may quietly content themselves in thinking that only the wicked will be turned into hell! Yet there could not be a greater mistake. For to all of us, old or young, God plainly declares, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that FORGET God," (Psalm ix. 17.)

We do not say, there is any doctrine in the church of Rome which tells us to forget God; but from the experience of hundreds of years among different nations, we know such has been the practical effect of the whole teaching of that apostate church. We see plainly in Roman Catholic countries how God is forgotten. His holy word, His holy day, are openly profaned, and the people are content with an outward service only. Is it surprising that those, who have lived in these countries should dread to see coming into dear old England the doctrines, which have led to such results; and that they should strive to keep out the flood before it undermines our faith and overflows our land?

But some of us may say, "I am only one, I cannot alter the services of the church I attend." But all congregations are made up of individuals, and if when their pastor first turned his back on them to face the Communion table, they had one by one got up and left the church, would he have continued to do so? And in that case would all this flood of error and superstition have flowed in among us? We now blame the Clergy, the Bishops, the Churchwardens, the Laws, every body, and every thing; but the real cause of the

whole evil—ourselves, the congregation, and that from just two causes, IGNORANCE and INDIFFERENCE! If we do not understand the meaning of these things we ought to do so, for we have an open Bible to refer to: and St. Peter says, “Be ready always to give an answer to every man, that asketh you, a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.” (1 Peter iii. 15.)

It is very difficult to get at the true reason, why some of the clergy turn their backs on the congregation, which they call the “Eastern Position,”—a position always taken by the clergy in the Church of Rome. Many reasons are given, which keep us in ignorance of its real meaning. Some say, that they turn to the east because they expect Christ to come in the east; and as the Communion Table stands at the eastern end of the Church the real reason is not at first detected. But the writer was once in a church built as these teachers would say the wrong way, so that the Communion Table stood at the north-west end, and yet the clergy—and there were generally several—always turned towards it! And although it was mentioned to them, that they were not turning to the east at all, but only to the north-west, they still continued the practice, thus showing that the east had nothing whatever to do with the matter; but that—as in the Church of Rome they always turn towards that place, where they think they have at any time placed the body and blood of our Lord—so any of our clergy holding this Roman Catholic doctrine turn also. We cannot of course say how much or how little of this doctrine they may hold, for they do not always fairly and plainly tell us. But so sure as we see them follow Rome’s custom in this matter, so sure may we be, that there is a leaning towards Rome’s doctrine, and the road we know is a downward one. We also know by sad experience, that those, who first began by thinking they could effect some little change in the bread and wine by the uttering of certain words, came soon, wonderfully soon, to hold the full error, if not in terms at least in practice. Therefore we are responsible in God’s sight for encouraging a false doctrine, every time we turn with them.

Also you encourage false doctrine every time you call the Communion Table an “Altar.”

As before stated, the meaning of “Altar” is that place whereon a sacrifice is offered up. Do you then hold as they do in the Church of Rome, that every time the clergyman consecrates the bread and wine he offers up as real a sacrifice, as when the Lord was crucified? If you do not believe this, why call the Communion Table an “Altar” just as those do who really hold this doctrine, for if there is no sacrifice then there can be no “altar”? No one calls the table on which they place a feast an “altar.” But some say, as an excuse for calling it so, that the Communion is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which it is; but that is not a real sacrifice in the sense requiring an altar; a real sacrifice requires a victim to be offered up. No clergyman, holding the doctrines of the Church of Rome, would consent for one moment to consider the Communion a sacrifice only of praise and thanksgiving; and on that account he would never use the first

prayer after the Communion—in which our Church calls it a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—but would always use the second prayer instead of it. And as the Reformers held, that the Communion was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving only and not a real sacrifice, they were careful never to call the Communion Table an “Altar.” And if you look all through the Prayer-book you will not find it once called an Altar.

But some may look upon the turning to the east or speaking of an altar as trifles! but are they indeed so? Then let us implore these clergy to give them up, since they are so painful to us. If they really think them trifles they will do so: *but do they?* Try if any of them would cease turning his face to the Communion Table. Not for the whole world would he do so! Neither would he on any account give up calling the Communion Table an “altar.” If then these things are not trifles in the eyes of our teachers WHO KNOW THEIR MEANING, should they then be regarded as trifles by us? When the Heathen were persecuting the Christians for refusing to worship their gods, a young and lovely woman was brought before the judges to be condemned to death for being a Christian. The test demanded of her was to offer corn for burning as incense to the false god, which she bravely refused to do. When some persons present, grieving that so young and lovely a woman should be put to death, implored her to consent, and one—placing a few grains of wheat in her hand—whispered “cast those grains on the incense and you are saved, do not suffer so fearful a death for such a trifle,” but she rejected the temptation and was torn to pieces by wild beasts. Only a few grains of wheat to burn, such a trifle, and she might have lived on! Have we her faith? alas no! grain after grain of trifles have we cast before the evil of superstition, and now we reap the full sheaf of false doctrine! Shall we continue to help on this evil crop?

There are many other pernicious doctrines of the Church of Rome, that are plainly coming back to us, and against which we have to watch and pray, that we be not drawn into encouraging them; but to enter on these would require a large volume. In a short paper such as this we can but try to answer your questions with regard to these seeming trifles introduced into the services of our Church, and explain why they are such a cause of sorrow to those, who understand their meaning, and who well know that when once these sign-posts have been set up, then the doctrines which they denote will soon be introduced, first into the singing, and then, by degrees, into the pulpit. At the first they may be so skilfully mixed up with real, glorious truths,—like bad shillings passed among genuine coin,—that the careless may fail to perceive them, but in due time the doctrines of Rome will be fully proclaimed—as one of these clergy lately boasted: “We brought in all these things while you Protestants were asleep and not minding;” and so we go on not minding, and some even consider us very uncharitable to mind at all. Thus we let them lead us on from singing praises of the Virgin Mary to singing praises to the Virgin, and then praying to her and the saints. Thus

also by constantly seeing a cross we are prepared to break the second commandment, and bow to a crucifix, which means a cross with the image of our Saviour on it. Then along with other errors gradually impressed on us, we at length come to confession;—some clergy even saying, that we are anxious and eager to confess to them, and that it is now time for the Bishops to appoint confessors all over England. And perhaps if we still sleep, as they boast we do, we shall be made to believe, they can give us absolution or forgiveness in God's stead, although from childhood we have had the word sounding in our ears, "One Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ."—(1 Tim. ii. 5.)

And so on through all Romish teaching. Some indeed of these clergy do not yet hold all the doctrines of the Church of Rome, but as they do not say, which they hold or which they reject; and as they may hold more of Romish doctrine at the end of the year than they did at the beginning of it, what security have we, if we lean on them for guidance? Especially when we find them encouraging their congregations to sing false doctrines, we may naturally conclude they hold them themselves and take warning accordingly.

But how thankful should we be, while these teachers give this uncertain sound, that we have our Bible in plain English, to search there like the noble Bereans and find the truth! How thankful too, that truly good men holding the truth wrote out for us those points of faith taken from the Bible, called the 39 Articles, which every member of the Church of England should compare with holy scripture and see that they agree with it! But perhaps you never cared to know what points of faith you really hold, and therefore do not now know how to set about it? Suppose then you hear from some of these clergymen that, every time they consecrate the bread and wine in the Communion there is as real a sacrifice of Christ, as when He was crucified in Jerusalem; look for yourself if that be the real voice of the Church, take the XXXIst Article, which you will find in your Prayer Book, and there you will see that our Church calls it a "blasphemous fable, and dangerous deceit." Read too the XXXIst Article with Heb. ix. 24-28, and you will find that "Christ only suffered once by the sacrifice of Himself." No man can repeat the sacrifice: for He offered Himself once for all, and for ever. By a reference Bible you will find many passages throughout Scripture proving the same glorious truth. Indeed the whole Bible, from Genesis to Revelation testifies that the Lord Jesus Christ offered Himself as a sacrifice for us—or as it is beautifully expressed in the prayer used at the consecrating the bread and wine—that He made on the cross by "one oblation of himself, ONCE OFFERED, a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Surely the voice of the Church of England gives no uncertain sound here, and agrees with the teaching of God's Holy Spirit. So too when you hear a minister profess to give Regeneration at Baptism—which means the new birth, or the being born again—read the XXVIIth Article, and you will find the Church

pronouncing Baptism to be "the *sign* of regeneration," not the new birth itself. Then read John iii., and you will learn that regeneration is the work of the Holy Ghost, and, like the blowing of the wind, unseen, unknown, at God's own time, not on any day or hour of man's appointment. And in Matthew iii. 11, we find that the great Baptist himself plainly stated, that he baptized with water only, and that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was the work of God alone. And so on through all our Articles of Faith. Let us compare them with Scripture, and thus be ready always to give a reason for the hope or faith we hold, not because we are told it, but because the Prayer-book derives it from God's Word. This privilege we could not have in the Church of Rome, for they call it "Private Judgment," and positively forbid it.

Here the question will naturally arise, "If our Articles are so plainly against the doctrines of the Church of Rome, how is it that some of our clergy can teach so contrary to them?" But these clergy, who teach us Roman Catholic doctrines, detest these Articles, and in their own writings mockingly call them (alluding to their number 39), the forty stripes save one laid on the Church—stripes they call them, and as stripes they regard and hate them. How they can reconcile it to their consciences to remain as teachers in a Church, whose points of faith they no longer believe we know not, unless it be to promote the advantage of the Church of Rome, whose doctrines they do hold. But your question, 'Why are these clergy so anxious to take us to Rome?' brings us to the most painful part of all. We would fain love those in error, but how hard to do so, when we fully know them to be the cause of all this evil. It is so opposite to the call of the Christian minister of the Gospel, whose one aim and object ought to be, like John the Baptist, to show the Lord to man, and say, "Behold the Lamb of God: He is preferred before *me*." While in the Church of Rome, the one end and aim of all its mighty world-wide work is the ELEVATION OF THE PRIESTHOOD. You can best understand this by supposing you really hold all the doctrines of Rome, and like a good Romanist without a question or a doubt. Suppose then you see a man, whom you in your heart fancy has the power, whenever he pleases, to bring the bodily real presence of the Lord Jesus on to the table before you, and place His flesh, bones, nerves, body, soul, and divinity in your mouth! Add to this, that you have told him every sin you have committed, and that he, as you fancy, has absolved you from them all, and that if when at the point of death you have time to send for him, he comes and gives you the flesh of the Lord to eat, it will secure your final salvation! And although he pretends that you will have to go through the fires of purgatory first, he strives to impress upon you, that by paying him well for the trouble, he can by his prayers shorten your time there. If you believe all this and more, without a shadow of a doubt that he has this real power given him by God, what must you think of him? Would you not regard him as almost equal to God Himself, and be thankful to kneel at his feet

for his blessing? When you have done this, you have done all that Rome requires; this is the end in all its fulness, in all its completeness, its bitter, bitter end. Is it any wonder that so many clergymen—especially the younger ones—should be tempted to teach doctrines, that secure them so exalted a position in the minds of men?

But although we may not regard the clergy in this superstitious way, many difficulties may prevent our withstanding them as St. Paul withstood St. Peter, when he saw he was to be blamed, yet—the ties of kindred and friendship notwithstanding—if we value the truth we must emulate St. Paul's faithfulness.

Still we hear it urged in their favour, that they are 'so zealous' and so 'earnest.' Earnest about what? If a man is eagerly picking your pocket will you give him your purse and say as a reason, he was so very earnest about getting it! the mere fact of earnestness about any thing is an absurd plea for consenting to it. Men have often been very earnest indeed in doing that, which they thought to be right. In 1555 the Roman Catholics were very much in earnest when they burned Bishop Hooper for refusing to hold their doctrines, and so slowly, that after long and patient sufferings he cried, "For God's love, good people, let me have more fire." And in 1855 the Roman Catholics were very much in earnest, when they burned the Bibles in the open street in Kingstown, near Dublin; they denied it afterwards, and at a distance their denial was believed: but the writer was living there at the time and read part of St. John's Gospel on a piece of the charred paper blown out from the fire, and well remembers the Artillery guns placed along the streets of Kingstown; the authorities fearing an outbreak from the infuriated Protestants after such an outrage on their feelings. Shall we consent then to these evil doings for the sake of the earnestness displayed? Even heathens are earnest in their religious views; for, to this day, when a heavy lumbering car is drawn in honour of a false god, some in the earnestness of their devotion cast themselves in front of it that the car may pass over them, leaving them crushed and mangled corpses! we must grant them 'earnestness' to the full, but shall we fall down and worship their god?

It is not denied that, as a rule, these teachers are good moral men, so too was the young ruler, who came to the Lord (see Mark x, 17-22), and could say he had kept all the commandments, and was indeed zealous to do right, according to his own notions, but did the Lord accept him for his zeal or his morality?

But besides false Brethren within the camp, we have a foe from without to contend with, which comes to us in the form of cowardice, and counsels our running away to some other communion. This, some among us have already done. But what sort of soldiers are they? The mightier the enemy the more bravely will the King's soldiers fight for a good cause. We must first examine our articles of faith, and if we be convinced of their entire agreement with God's word, let us stand by them shoulder to shoulder, be the foe ever so strong within or without; let us hold on to our faith through all,

ever though we may have like saintly Hooper to cry out for "more fire." The doctrines of the Church of England are just as pure and as true now, as at the time of the Reformation. And if there are those within her, who have gone back to the errors from which the Reformation set us free, *they* have not altered our beloved Church in any jot or tittle. If any leave her, let it be those who have abandoned her doctrines, not those who hold them in all their scriptural purity and beauty. How could we leave her?

"O bid me leave all else beside,
The near and dear I've known,
But not the Church of England,
My father's and my own."

And why should we go forth as wandering stars searching for the truth among other communions, while we have in our own as near an approach to the truth as is attainable in any earthly church? Until the Head of the Church Himself returns, we must expect to have imperfections among us.

We are aware, that several religious communities claim to be perfect, or at least to be free from the imperfections of other communities, and the votaries of each hold out their hands to us, calling on us to come to them. But let *us* not be tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine. (Eph. iv. 14.) Let us prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. (1 Thess. v. 21.) And as we have received Christ Jesus the Lord, let us so walk in him, rooted and built up in Him, and stablished in the faith as we have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. (Col. ii. 6-7.) Then neither Rome nor any other form of error can move us, for we are founded on a Rock—not Peter but the Lord! And let us remember St. Paul's request to his people, "Brethren, pray for us." (1 Thess. v. 25.) Are we clear in this matter? or are we not verily guilty concerning our Brother? Have we been a praying people? Have we been holding up our hands to God for our Pastors, that their faith might be strengthened and their strength be upheld in the holy work, to which they have been called? Had it been so, what showers of blessings would the Lord have sent down on all Bishops and Curates, and on all congregations committed to their charge!

That it may please Thee to illuminate all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons with true knowledge and understanding of Thy word, and that both by their preaching and living they may set it forth and show it accordingly,

"We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord."

THE EASTWARD POSITION!

BY THE REV. CANON J. C. RYLE,

Vicar of Stradbroke.

THE famous expression which heads this page demands the serious attention of all English Churchmen. It is bound up with a subject which is causing much excitement, and making a great stir in many minds. It is of the utmost importance to have clear views about it.

What does this "Eastward position" mean? Where is the harm of it? To these two questions it is proposed to supply answers in this paper.

The "Eastward position" means a bodily position used by certain clergymen at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, during the act of consecrating the elements of bread and wine. These clergymen perform this act of consecration standing in front of the communion table, turning their backs towards the congregation (so that the people cannot see what they are doing) and turning their faces towards the East. Hence it is called the "Eastward position."

Now, is this "Eastward position," as many say, a matter of indifference? Is it one of those points about which every clergyman may be allowed to do what he likes? Is it a mere trifle which does not signify and may be sanctioned without harm? It is nothing of the kind. It is a point of vast importance. Let us see.

The harm of the "Eastward position" consists in this, that it is the outward and visible sign of an unscriptural, mischievous, and soul-injuring doctrine. That doctrine is nothing less than this, that the Lord's Supper is a proper sacrifice,—that the officiating clergyman is a sacrificing priest,—that the communion table is an altar,—and that in the act of consecration some mysterious change takes place in the bread and wine. All this, and nothing less than this, lies at the bottom of the "Eastward position." It is, to speak plainly, a step toward the Romish sacrifices of the mass, which the 31st article of

the Church of England declares to be "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." It is in reality an action which pours contempt on the finished sacrifice of Christ.

It may be freely admitted that many English clergymen have always used the "Eastward position" in the Lord's Supper without the slightest wrong intention. They have used it in simplicity, and for convenience sake, and meant no harm. There are hundreds, on the other hand, it may be feared, who are using it as the symbol of a doctrine which they want to maintain and spread, but which ought to be resisted by all faithful Churchmen. The following extracts supply abundant proof that there is ground for saying this. They speak for themselves.

Extracts from a Ritualistic Catechism, "*The Ritual Reason Why*."—

1. *What is Ritual?* It is the employment of symbols in Divine Worship according to a recognized or traditional system.

2. *To what end are symbols thus employed?* Partly to uphold the dignity of divine worship and partly to shadow forth by outward deed and gesture certain truths which might otherwise be lost sight of.

301. . . . *Explain in general why in the greater part of the celebration of the Holy Communion he (the priest) keeps his back to the people?* . . . This was also the position of the Jewish Priest, who ministered, "before the Lord," at the Altar of Incense, and at the table of shew-bread, i.e. facing the hidden mercy-seat beyond. As to the position being observed in this place it is sufficient to say that the Priest being [engaged in an act of Ministry before the Lord, although in the presence and on behalf of the people,] he only turns from the Altar for some weighty cause and in direct addresses to the flock.

345. *Why is the Priest to say it (the Prayer of Consecration) "standing before the" Altar?* Because this is the position of a Sacrificing Priest.

340. *What is the prayer which the priest says kneeling at the midst of the Altar?*

It is a humble acknowledgment of his own unworthiness to execute the ministry which he is about to perform, and of that of the communicants to join with him in the Sacrifice by feasting on the Sacred Victim who is now about to be offered.—*Ritual Reason Why*, p. 136.

Dr. Pusey says:—

"The standing before the Altar, means the primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the bowing after the Sarum use at the Consecration means Eucharistic adoration."—*Extract from Speech at St. James' Hall, Church Review, June, 1874.*

All Englishmen who desire the peace and prosperity of the Reformed Church of England have now a plain duty before them in the present day. They ought to resist any attempt to sanction the "Eastward position" in the worship of the Established Church, by whomsoever it may be made, and from whatever quarter it may

proceed. They ought to know that a strong effort is likely to be made in Convocation to obtain a report to Parliament (under the recent letter of business for the revision of rubrics) recommending that the Prayer-book rubrics should be so altered as to permit the "Eastward position" being used. To prevent such a Report being made, and to resist its adoption by Parliament, if it is made, should be the aim and endeavour of every faithful Protestant Churchman.

Once, for all, let the following points be impressed on our minds.

1. The "Eastward position" is utterly without warrant of Scripture. The four accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper, written by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Paul, do not say one word to favour it. Any plain, impartial, unprejudiced man, reading the simple narrative of the New Testament for the first time, would say unhesitatingly that whatever our blessed Lord did, when he broke the bread and gave the cup, was done before, under the eyes, and in full view of, the whole congregation of the Apostles. Why are clergymen to appear to make a mystery where our Lord made none?

2. The "Eastward position" is utterly without warrant of the Prayer-book, fairly and reasonably interpreted. The Communion office nowhere calls the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, and nowhere calls the Lord's Table an altar. The rubric which regulates and directs the minister's position, in the act of consecrating the bread and wine, distinctly says that he should "break the bread and take the cup into his hand *before the people*." If "*before the people*" can be twisted into meaning "with his back to the people," there really is no meaning in words! The rubric, moreover, on this point, is the more remarkable, because it *first* directs the minister to "stand before the table," and "order the bread and wine," so that he may afterwards do what he does "with readiness and decency." But, *after* he has ordered, or put in proper position, the elements, he is to perform the act of consecration "*before the people*,"—that is, standing in such a position that all can see what he does.

To prevent doubt, and to prove that this explanation is not modern and newly invented, let us hear what Professor Blunt and Wheatley, no mean authorities, say on the subject of this sadly misunderstood rubric.

BLUNT says:—

"This rubric, again, has ministered cause of debate. 'The priest, standing *before the table*,' you will take notice, is a different phrase from 'standing at the *north side of the table*,' and implies a different thing—viz., that he shall stand up front of the table, with his back to the people, till he has '*ordered*' the elements, and prepared them for the rite, interposing his person between the congregation and the table, till whatever is merely *mechanical* in the act shall have been completed, the Church not wishing to make the meaner part of the service a spectacle.

"This done, he returns to the north side, and breaks the bread, and takes the cup '*before the people*,' i.e., *in their sight*—the Church not wishing to make the

manner of consecration, as the Romish priest does, a mystery. Thus the former position was merely taken up in order to the subsequent act, that the priest ‘*may, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread.*’ So that they mistake this rubric altogether, I apprehend, and violate both its letter and spirit, who *consecrate* the elements with their backs to the people, after the manner of the Church of Rome. All that they have to do in that position is to *order* the elements, so that they *may* afterwards break the bread and take the cup with more decency.”—*(Blunt: Lectures on the Duties of the Parish Priest, sixth edition, p. 333.)*

WHEATLEY says :—

“If it be asked whether the Priest is to say the prayer of consecration standing before the table, or at the north end of it; I answer, at the north end of it: for according to the rules of grammar, the participle *standing* must refer to the verb *ordered*, and not to the verb *say*. So that whilst the Priest is *ordering the bread and wine*, he is to stand before the table: but when he says the prayer, he is to stand so as *that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people*, which must be on the north side. For if he stood *before* the table, his body would hinder the people from seeing: so that he must not stand there: and consequently he must stand on the north side; there being, in our present rubric, no other place mentioned for performing any part of this office. In the Romish Church indeed they always stand *before* the altar during the time of consecration; in order to prevent the people from being eye-witnesses of their operation in working their pretended miracle: and in the Greek Church they shut the chancel door, or at least draw a veil or curtain before it, I suppose, upon the same account. But our Church, that pretends no such miracle, enjoins, we see, the direct contrary to this, by ordering the priest so *to order the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread, and take the cup into his hands before the people*. And with this view, it is probable, the Scotch liturgy ordered, *that during the time of consecration the presbyter should stand at such a part of the holy table, where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands.*”—*(Wheatley on the Common Prayer. Tegg’s Edition, p. 296, 1845.)*

3. Last, but not least, the “Eastward position” is a direct step towards Popery. Whether its friends and advocates like to admit this or not, it is a simple matter of fact. It is a retrograde movement towards that unscriptural and superstitious system of religion which our martyred reformers resisted to the death. It is a departure from the Protestant principles on which the Church of England was established three centuries ago, and which have been her strength, her glory, and her beauty. If we value an open Bible, a free gospel, and a deliverance from priestcraft, let us resolve never to consent to the sanction of the “Eastward position” in the Church of England, and let us use every lawful means to prevent it.

To be obtained at the Office of the Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London.
By Subscribers, for distribution, free. By others at 3d per dozen, or 1s 6d per 100.

48th Thousand.]

PERIL OF IDOLATRY

AND

SUPERFLUOUS DECKING OF CHURCHES.

Among the Homilies of our Church which are stated in the XXXV Article to "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times" is that "AGAINST PERIL OF IDOLATRY AND SUPERFLUOUS DECKING OF CHURCHES."

Some extracts from Homily No. 2 are here given, and will be found applicable to the present times, and worthy of careful perusal, they are made from the 1852 Edition of the "Prayer Book and Homily Society."

The church or house of God is a place appointed by the Holy Scriptures, where the lively *word of God* ought to be read, taught, and heard, the Lord's holy name called upon by *public prayer*, *heartly thanks* given to his majesty for his infinite and unspeakable benefits bestowed upon us, his *holy sacraments* duly and reverently ministered; and that therefore all that be godly indeed ought both with diligence at times appointed, to repair together to the said church, and there with all reverence to use and behave themselves before the Lord.

These are the true ornaments of the said house of God, and not any outward ceremonies or costly and glorious decking of the said house or temple of the Lord; contrary to the most manifest doctrine of the Scriptures, and contrary to the usage of the primitive church, which was most pure and un-corrupt; and contrary to the sentences and judgments of the most ancient, learned, and godly doctors of the church, (as hereafter shall appear). The corruption of these latter days hath brought into the church infinite multitudes of images, and the same, with other parts of the temple also, have decked with gold and silver, painted with colours, set them with stone and pearl, clothed them with silks and precious vestures; fancying untruly that to be the chief decking and adorning of the temple or house of God, and that all people should be the more moved to the due reverence of the same, if all corners thereof were glorious, and glistering with gold and precious stones. Whereas indeed they by the said images, and such glorious decking of the temple, have nothing at all profited such as were wise and of understanding; but have thereby greatly hurt the simple and unwise, occasioning them thereby to commit most horrible idolatry.—*Ibid.* p. 3.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamine in Cyprus, a very holy and learned man, who lived in Theodosius the emperor's time, about three hundred and ninety years after our Saviour Christ's ascension, writeth thus to John, patriarch of Jerusalem, "I entered (saith Epiphanius) into a certain church to pray: I found there a linen cloth hanging in the church door, painted, and having in it the image of Christ, as it were, or of some other saint, (for I remember not well whose image it was) therefore when I did see the image of a man hanging in the church of Christ, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, I did tear it, and gave counsel to the keepers of the church, that they should wind a poor man that was dead in the said cloth, and so bury him."

And afterwards the same Epiphanius, sending another unpainted cloth, for that painted one which he had torn, to the said patriarch, writeth thus, "I pray you, will the elders of that place to receive this cloth, which I have sent by this bearer, and command them that from henceforth no such painted cloths, contrary to our religion, be hanged in the church of Christ. For it becometh your goodness rather to have this care, that you take away such scrupulosity, which is unfitting for the church of Christ, and offensive to the people committed to your charge." And this epistle, as worthy to be read of many, did St. Jerome himself translate into the Latin tongue.—*Ibid.* p. 18.

Thus you see what authority St. Jerome and that most ancient history, give unto the holy and learned bishop Epiphanius, whose judgment of images in churches and temples, then beginning by stealth to creep in, is worthy to be noted.

First, he judged it contrary to Christian religion and the authority of the Scriptures, to have any images in Christ's church. Secondly, he rejected not only carved, graven, and molten images, but also painted images, out of Christ's church. Thirdly, that he regarded not whether it were the image of Christ, or of any other saint; but being an image, would not suffer it in the church. Fourthly, that he did not only remove it out of the church, but with a vehement zeal tare it in sunder, and exhorted that a corse should be wrapped and buried in it, judging it meet for nothing but to rot in the earth: following herein the example of the good king Hezekiah, who *brake the brazen serpent to pieces*, and burned it to ashes, for that idolatry was committed to it [2 Kings xviii. 4]. Last of all, that Epiphanius thinketh it the duty of vigilant bishops to be careful that no images be permitted in the church, for that they be occasion of scruple and offence to the people committed to their charge.—*Ibid.* p. 19.

But as all things that be amiss have from a tolerable beginning grown worse and worse, till they at the last became intolerable, so did this matter of images. First, men used privately stories painted in tables, cloths, and walls. Afterwards gross and embossed images privately in their own houses. Then afterwards, pictures first, and after them, embossed images began to creep into churches, learned and godly men ever speaking against them. Then by use it was openly maintained, that they might be in churches; but yet forbidden that they should be worshipped.—*Ibid.* p. 27.

Not only the simple and unwise (unto whom images, as the Scriptures teach, be specially a snare) but the bishops, and learned men also, fall to idolatry by occasion of images, yea and make decrees and laws also for the maintenance of the same. So hard is it, and indeed impossible, any long time to have images publicly in churches and temples without idolatry.—*Ibid.* p. 32.

Wherefore let us beseech God, that we, being warned by his holy word, forbidding all idolatry, and by the writings of old godly doctors, and ecclesiastical histories, written and preserved by God's ordinance for our admonition and warning, may flee from all idolatry, and so escape the horrible punishment and plagues, as well worldly as everlasting, threatened for the same: which God our heavenly Father grant us, for our only Saviour and Mediator, Jesus Christ's sake. *Amen.*—*Ibid.* p. 39

We are not so superstitious or scrupulous, that we do abhor either flowers wrought in carpets, hangings, and other arras; either the images of princes, printed or stamped in their coins, which when Christ did see in a Roman coin, we read not that he reprehended it; neither do we condemn the arts of painting and image-making, as wicked of themselves. But we would admit and grant them, that images used for no religion, or superstition rather, we mean images of none worshipped, nor in danger to be worshipped of any, may be suffered. But images placed publicly

in temples cannot possibly be without danger of worshipping and idolatry, wherefore they are not publicly to be had or suffered in temples or churches.—*Ibid.* p. 47.

First, for that all images, so set up publicly, have been worshipped by the unlearned and simple sort shortly after they have been publicly so set up, and in conclusion by the wise and learned also. Secondly, for that they are worshipped in sundry places now in our time also. And thirdly, for that it is impossible that images of God, Christ, or his saints, can be suffered (especially in temples and churches) any while or space, without worshipping of them: and that idolatry, which is most abominable before God, cannot possibly be escaped and avoided, without the abolishing and destruction of images and pictures in temples and churches; for that idolatry is to images, specially in temples and churches, an inseparable accident (as they term it); so that images in churches and idolatry go always both together, and that therefore the one cannot be avoided, except the other (specially in all public places) be destroyed. Wherefore, to make images, and publicly to set them up in temples and churches; places appointed peculiarly to the service of God, is to make images to the use of religion, and not only against this precept, *Thou shalt make no manner of images*; but against this also, *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them*. For they being set up, have been, be, and ever will be worshipped.—*Ibid.* p. 49.

Our image-worshippers give both names of God and the saints, and also the honour due to God, to their images, even as did the Gentiles idolaters to their idols. What should it mean that they, according as did the Gentiles idolaters, light candles at noontime, or at mid-night before them, but therewith to honour them? For other use is there none in so doing. For in the day it needeth not, but was ever a proverb of foolishness, to light a candle at noon-time. And in the night it availeth not to light a candle before the blind, and God hath neither use nor honour thereof. And concerning this candle-lighting, it is notable that Lactantius (Inst. lib. vi. cap 2,) above a thousand years ago hath written after this manner, "If they would behold the heavenly light of the sun, then should they perceive that God hath no need of their candles, who for the use of man hath made so goodly a light." "Seemeth he therefore to be in his right mind, who offereth up to the Giver of all light the light of a wax-candle for a gift? He requireth another light of us, which is not smoky, but bright and clear, even the light of mind and understanding."—*Ibid.* p. 56.

Do not all stories ecclesiastical declare, that our holy martyrs, rather than they would bow and kneel, or offer up one crumb of incense before an image or idol, have suffered a thousand kinds of most horrible and dreadful death? And what excuses soever they make, yet that all this running on pilgrimage, burning of incense and candles, hanging up of crutches, chains, ships, arms, legs, and whole men and women of wax, kneeling and holding up of hands, is done to the images, appeareth by this, that were no images be, or where they have been and be taken away, they do no such things at all. But all the places frequented when the images were there, now they be taken away, be forsaken and left desert; nay, now they hate and abhor the place deadly; which is an evident proof, that that which they did before was done in respect of the images. Wherefore, when we see men and women on heaps go on pilgrimage to images, kneel before them, hold up their hands before them, set up candles, burn incense before them, offer up gold and silver unto them, hang up ships, crutches, chains, men and women of wax before them, attributing health and safeguard, the gifts of God, to them, or the saints whom they represent, as they rather would have it. Who, I say, who can doubt, but that our image-maintainers, agreeing in all idolatrous opinions, outward rites and ceremonies, with the Gentiles idolaters, agree also with them in committing most abominable idolatry?—*ibid.* p. 57.

But in this they pass the folly and wickedness of the Gentiles, that they

honour and worship the relics and bones of our saints, which prove that they be mortal men and dead, and therefore no gods to be worshipped, which the Gentiles would never confess of their gods for very shame. But the relics we must kiss and offer unto, specially on 'relic-sunday.' And while we offer (that we should not be weary or repent us of our cost) the music and minstrelsy goeth merrily all the offertory time, with praising and calling upon those saints, whose relics be then in presence. Yea, and the water also, wherein those relics have been dipped, must with great reverence be reserved, as very holy and effectual. Is this agreeable to St. Chrysostom, who writeth thus of relics? "Do not regard the ashes of the saints' bodies, nor the relics of their flesh and bones, consumed with time: but open the eyes of thy faith, and behold them clothed with heavenly virtue, and the grace of the Holy Ghost, and shining with the brightness of the heavenly light."—*Ibid.* p. 59.

But images in churches and temples have been, and be, and (as afterward shall be proved) ever will be, offences and stumbling-blocks, specially to the weak, simple, and blind common people, deceiving their hearts by the cunning of the artificer (as the Scripture expressly in sundry places doth testify,) and so bringing them to idolatry (Wisd. xiii. xiv). Therefore woe be to the erecter, setter-up, and maintainer of images in churches and temples; for a greater penalty remaineth for him than the death of the body.—*Ibid.* p. 62.

It is not possible, if images be suffered in churches and temples, either by preaching of God's word, or by any other means, to keep the people from worshipping of them, and so to avoid idolatry.—*Ibid.* p. 63.

It is truly said, that times past are schoolmasters of wisdom to us that follow and live after. Therefore if in times past the most virtuous and best learned, the most diligent also, and in number almost infinite, ancient fathers, bishops, and doctors, with their writing, preaching, industry, earnestness, authority, assemblies, and councils, could do nothing against images and idolatry, to images once set up; what can we, neither in learning, nor holiness of life, neither in diligence, neither authority, to be compared with them, but men in contempt, and of no estimation, (as the world goeth now) a few also in number, in so great a multitude and malice of men. What can we do, I say, or bring to pass, to the stay of idolatry or worshipping of images, if they be allowed to stand publicly in temples and churches? . . . Let us therefore of these latter days learn this lesson of the experience of ancient antiquity, that idolatry cannot possibly be separated from images any long time: and that as an unseparable accident, or as a shadow followeth the body when the sun shineth, so idolatry followeth and cleaveth to the public having of images in temples and churches. And finally, as idolatry is to be abhorred and avoided, so are images (which cannot be long without idolatry) to be put away and destroyed.—*Ibid.* pp. 68, 69.

Let us honour and worship for religion's sake none but him, and him let us worship and honour as he will himself, and hath declared by his word, that he will be honoured and worshipped; not in nor by images or idols, which he hath most straitly forbidden; neither in kneeling, lighting of candles, burning of incense, offering up of gifts unto images and idols, to believe that we shall please him, for all these be abomination before God. But let us honour and worship God *in spirit and truth*, fearing and loving him above all things, trusting in him only, calling upon him, and praying to him only, praising and lauding of him only, and all other in him, and for him. For such worshippers doth our heavenly Father love, who is a most pure Spirit, and therefore will be worshipped *in spirit and truth* (John iv. 24).—*Ibid.* p. 89.

PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT.

[37 & 38 VICT. CH. 85.]

ARRANGEMENT OF CLAUSES.

A. D. 1874.

Clauses.

1. Short title.
2. Commencement of Act.
3. Extent of Act.
4. Proceedings under this Act not to be deemed proceedings under 3 & 4 Vict. c. 86. s. 23.
5. Saving of jurisdiction.
6. Interpretation of terms.
7. Appointment and duties of judge.
8. Representation by archdeacon, churchwarden, parishioners, or inhabitants of diocese.
9. Proceedings on representation.
10. Registrar of the diocese to perform duties under the Act.
11. Parties may appear in person or by counsel, &c.
12. No fresh evidence to be admitted on appeal.
13. Inhibition of incumbent.
14. Faculty not necessary in certain cases.
15. Service of notices.
16. Substitute for bishop when patron, or in case of illness.
17. Provisions relating to cathedral or collegiate church.
18. Limitation of proceedings against incumbent.
19. Rules for settling procedure and fees under this Act.

SCHEDULES.

A.D. 1874.

CHAPTER 85.

An Act for the better administration of the Laws respecting the regulation of Public Worship. [7th August 1874.]

WHEREAS it is expedient that in certain cases further regulations should be made for the administration of the laws relating to the performance of divine service according to the use of the Church of England:

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

Short title. 1. This Act may be cited as The Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874.

**Com-
mence-
ment of
Act.** 2. This Act shall come into operation on the first day of July one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five, except where expressly herein-after provided.

**Extent of
Act.** 3. This Act shall extend to that part of the United Kingdom called England, to the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man.

**Proceed-
ings under
this Act
not to be
deemed
proceed-
ings under
3 & 4 Vict.
c. 86. s. 23.
Saving of
jurisdic-
tion.** 4. Proceedings taken under this Act shall not be deemed to be such proceedings as are mentioned in the Act of the third and fourth year of the reign of Her Majesty, chapter eighty-six, section twenty-three.

5. Nothing in this Act contained, save as herein expressly provided, shall be construed to affect or repeal any jurisdiction which may now be in force for the due administration of ecclesiastical law.

6. In this Act the following terms, shall, if not inconsistent with the context, be thus interpreted—

**Interpreta-
tion of
terms.
"Bishop."** The term "bishop" means the archbishop or bishop of the diocese in which the church or burial ground is situated to which a representation relates:

**"Book of
Common
Prayer."** The term "Book of Common Prayer" means the book annexed to the Act of the fourteenth year of the reign of King Charles the

Second, chapter four, intituled "The Book of Common Prayer, A.D. 1874. —
 "and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and
 "Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church
 "of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David,
 "pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches; and the
 "form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of
 "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;" together with such altera-
 tions as have from time to time been or may hereafter be made
 in the said book by lawful authority :

The term "burial ground" means any churchyard, cemetery, or "Burial
 burial ground, or the part of any cemetery or burial ground, in ground."
 which, at the burial of any corpse therein, the order for the
 burial of the dead contained in the Book of Common Prayer is
 directed by law to be used :

The term "church" means any church, chapel, or place of public "Church."
 worship in which the incumbent is by law or by the terms of
 license from the bishop required to conduct divine service
 according to the Book of Common Prayer :

The term "diocese" means the diocese in which the church or "Diocese."
 burial ground is situated to which a representation relates, and
 comprehends all places which are situate within the limits of
 such diocese :

The term "incumbent" means the person or persons in holy "Incum-
 orders legally responsible for the due performance of divine bent."
 service in any church, or of the order for the burial of the dead
 in any burial ground :

The term "parish" means any parish, ecclesiastical district, "Parish."
 chapelry, or place, over which any incumbent has the exclusive
 cure of souls :

The term "parishioner" means a male person of full age who "Parish-
 before making any representation under this Act has transmitted ioner."
 to the bishop under his hand the declaration contained in
 Schedule (A.) to this Act, and who has, and for one year next
 before taking any proceeding under this Act has had, his usual
 place of abode in the parish within which the church or burial

A.D. 1874. ground is situate, or for the use of which the burial ground is legally provided, to which the representation relates:

“Barrister-at-law.” The term “barrister-at-law” shall in the Isle of Man include advocate:

“Rules and orders.” The term “rules and orders” means the rules and orders framed under the provisions of this Act.

Appointment and duties of judge. 7. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York may, but subject to the approval of Her Majesty to be signified under Her Sign Manual, appoint from time to time a barrister-at-law who has been in actual practice for ten years, or a person who has been a judge of one of the Superior Courts of Law or Equity, or of any court to which the jurisdiction of any such court has been or may hereafter be transferred by authority of Parliament, to be, during good behaviour, a judge of the Provincial Courts of Canterbury and York, herein-after called the judge.

If the said archbishops shall not, within six months after the passing of this Act, or within six months after the occurrence of any vacancy in the office, appoint the said judge, Her Majesty may by Letters Patent appoint some person, qualified as aforesaid, to be such judge.

Whensoever a vacancy shall occur in the office of official principal of the Arches Court of Canterbury, the judge shall become ex officio such official principal, and all proceedings thereafter taken before the judge in relation to matters arising within the province of Canterbury shall be deemed to be taken in the Arches Court of Canterbury; and whensoever a vacancy shall occur in the office of official principal or auditor of the Chancery Court of York, the judge shall become ex officio such official principal or auditor, and all proceedings thereafter taken before the judge in relation to matters arising within the province of York shall be deemed to be taken in the Chancery Court of York; and whensoever a vacancy shall occur in the office of Master of the Faculties to the Archbishop of Canterbury, such judge shall become ex officio such Master of the Faculties.

Every person appointed to be a judge under this Act shall be a member of the Church of England, and shall, before entering on his

office, sign the declaration in Schedule (A.) to this Act; and if at any time any such judge shall cease to be a member of the Church, his office shall thereupon be vacant. A.D. 1874.

This section shall come into operation immediately after the passing of this Act.

8. If the archdeacon of the archdeaconry, or a churchwarden of the parish, or any three parishioners of the parish, within which archdeaconry or parish any church or burial ground is situate, or for the use of any part of which any burial ground is legally provided, or in case of cathedral or collegiate churches, any three inhabitants of the diocese, being male persons of full age, who have signed and transmitted to the bishop under their hands the declaration contained in Schedule (A) under this Act, and who have, and for one year next before taking any proceeding under this Act have had, their usual place of abode in the diocese within which the cathedral or collegiate church is situated, shall be of opinion,—

Representation by archdeacon, churchwarden, parishioners, or inhabitants of diocese.

- (1.) That in such church any alteration in or addition to the fabric, ornaments, or furniture thereof has been made without lawful authority, or that any decoration forbidden by law has been introduced into such church; or,
- (2.) That the incumbent has within the preceding twelve months used or permitted to be used in such church or burial ground any unlawful ornament of the minister of the church, or neglected to use any prescribed ornament or vesture; or,
- (3.) That the incumbent has within the preceding twelve months failed to observe, or to cause to be observed, the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer relating to the performance, in such church or burial ground, of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the said book, or has made or permitted to be made any unlawful addition to, alteration of, or omission from such services, rites, and ceremonies,—

such archdeacon, churchwarden, parishioners, or such inhabitants of the diocese, may, if he or they think fit, represent the same to the bishop by sending to the bishop a form, as contained in

A.D. 1874. Schedule (B.) to this Act, duly filled up and signed, and accompanied by a declaration made by him or them under the Act of the fifth and sixth year of the reign of King William the Fourth, chapter sixty-two, affirming the truth of the statements contained in the representation: Provided, that no proceeding shall be taken under this Act as regards any alteration in or addition to the fabric of a church if such alteration or addition has been completed five years before the commencement of such proceedings.

Proceed-
ings on re-
presenta-
tion.

9. Unless the bishop shall be of opinion, after considering the whole circumstances of the case, that proceedings should not be taken on the representation, (in which case he shall state in writing the reason for his opinion, and such statement shall be deposited in the registry of the diocese, and a copy thereof shall forthwith be transmitted to the person or some one of the persons who shall have made the representation, and to the person complained of,) he shall within twenty-one days after receiving the representation transmit a copy thereof to the person complained of, and shall require such person, and also the person making the representation, to state in writing within twenty-one days whether they are willing to submit to the directions of the bishop touching the matter of the said representation, without appeal; and if they shall state their willingness to submit to the directions of the bishop without appeal, the bishop shall forthwith proceed to hear the matter of the representation in such manner as he shall think fit, and shall pronounce such judgment and issue such monition (if any) as he may think proper, and no appeal shall lie from such judgment or monition.

Provided, that no judgment so pronounced by the bishop shall be considered as finally deciding any question of law so that it may not be again raised by other parties.

The parties may, at any time after the making of a representation to the bishop, join in stating any questions arising in such proceedings in a special case signed by a barrister-at-law for the opinion of the judge, and the parties after signing and transmitting the same to the bishop may require it to be transmitted to the judge for hearing, and the judge shall hear and determine the question or questions arising thereon, and any judgment pronounced by the bishop shall be in conformity with such determination.

If the person making the representation and the person complained of shall not, within the time aforesaid, state their willingness to submit to the directions of the bishop, the bishop shall forthwith transmit the representation in the mode prescribed by the rules and orders to the archbishop of the province, and the archbishop shall forthwith require the judge to hear the matter of the representation at any place within the diocese or province, or in London or Westminster. A.D. 1874.

The judge shall give not less than twenty-eight days notice to the parties of the time and place at which he will proceed to hear the matter of the said representation. The judge before proceeding to give such notice shall require from the person making the representation such security for costs as the judge may think proper, such security to be given in the manner prescribed by the rules and orders.

The person complained of shall within twenty-one days after such notice transmit to the judge, and to the person making the representation, a succinct answer to the representation, and in default of such answer he shall be deemed to have denied the truth or relevancy of the representation.

In all proceedings before the judge under this Act the evidence shall be given *vivâ voce*, in open court, and upon oath; and the judge shall have the powers of a court of record, and may require and enforce the attendance of witnesses, and the production of evidences, books, or writings, in the like manner as a judge of one of the superior courts of law or equity, or of any court to which the jurisdiction of any such court has been or may hereafter be transferred by authority of Parliament.

Unless the parties shall both agree that the evidence shall be taken down by a shorthand writer, and that a special case shall not be stated, the judge shall state the facts proved before him in the form of a special case, similar to a special case stated under the Common Law Procedure Acts, 1852-1854.

The judge shall pronounce judgment on the matter of the representation, and shall deliver to the parties, on application, and to the bishop, a copy of the special case, if any, and judgment.

A.D. 1874. The judge shall issue such monition (if any) and make such order as to costs as the judgment shall require.

Upon every judgment of the judge, or monition issued in accordance therewith, an appeal shall lie, in the form prescribed by rules and orders, to Her Majesty in Council.

The judge may, on application in any case, suspend the execution of such monition pending an appeal, if he shall think fit.

Registrar of the diocese to perform duties under the Act. **10.** The registrar of the diocese, or his deputy duly appointed, shall perform such duties in relation to this Act and shall receive such fees as may be prescribed by the rules and orders.

Parties may appear in person or by counsel, &c. **11.** In any proceedings under this Act either party may appear either by himself in person or by counsel, or by any proctor or any attorney or solicitor.

No fresh evidence to be admitted on appeal. Inhibition of Incumbent. **12.** For the purpose of an appeal to Her Majesty in Council under this Act, the special case settled by the judge, or a copy of the shorthand writer's notes, as the case may be, shall be transmitted in the manner prescribed by rules and orders, and no fresh evidence shall be admitted upon appeal except by the permission of the tribunal hearing the appeal.

13. Obedience by an incumbent to a monition or order of the bishop or judge, as the case may be, shall be enforced, if necessary, in the manner prescribed by rules and orders, by an order inhibiting the incumbent from performing any service of the church or otherwise exercising the cure of souls within the diocese for a term not exceeding three months; provided that at the expiration of such term the inhibition shall not be relaxed until the incumbent shall, by writing under his hand, in the form prescribed by the rules and orders, undertake to pay due obedience to such monition or order, or to the part thereof which shall not have been annulled; provided that if such inhibition shall remain in force for more than three years from the date of the issuing of the monition, or from the final determination of an appeal therefrom, whichever shall last happen, or if a second inhibition in regard to the same monition shall be issued within three years from the relaxation of an inhibition, any benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment held by the

incumbent in the parish in which the church or burial ground is situate, or for the use of which the burial ground is legally provided, in relation to which church or burial ground such monition has been issued as aforesaid, shall thereupon become void, unless the bishop shall, for some special reason stated by him in writing, postpone for a period not exceeding three months the date at which, unless such inhibition be relaxed, such benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment shall become void as aforesaid; and upon any such avoidance it shall be lawful for the patron of such benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment to appoint, present, collate, or nominate to the same as if such incumbent were dead; and the provisions contained in the Act of the first and second year of the reign of Her Majesty, chapter one hundred and six, section fifty-eight, in reference to notice to the patron and as to lapse, shall be applicable to any benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment avoided under this Act; and it shall not be lawful for the patron at any time to appoint, present, collate, or nominate to such benefice or such other ecclesiastical preferment the incumbent by whom the same was avoided under this Act.

The bishop may, during such inhibition, unless he is satisfied that due provision is otherwise made for the spiritual charge of the parish, make due provision for the service of the church and the cure of souls, and it shall be lawful for the bishop to raise the sum required from time to time for such provision by sequestration of the profits of such benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment.

Any question as to whether a monition or order given or issued after proceedings before the bishop or judge, as the case may be, has or has not been obeyed shall be determined by the bishop or the judge, and any proceedings to enforce obedience to such monition or order shall be taken by direction of the judge.

14. It shall not be necessary to obtain a faculty from the ordinary in order lawfully to obey any monition issued under this Act, and if the judge shall direct in any monition that a faculty shall be applied for, such fees only shall be paid for such faculty as may be directed by the rules and orders; provided that nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to limit or control the direction vested by law in the ordinary as to the grant or refusal of a faculty: Provided also, that a faculty shall, on application, be granted, if unopposed, on

Faculty
not neces-
sary in
certain
cases.

A.D. 1874. payment of such a fee (not exceeding two guineas) as shall be prescribed by the rules and orders, in respect of any alteration in or addition to the fabric of any church, or in respect of any ornaments or furniture, not being contrary to law, made or existing in any church at the time of the passing of this Act.

Service of
notices.

15. All notices and other documents directed to be given to any person under this Act shall be given in the manner prescribed by rules and orders.

Substitute
for bishop
when
patron, or
in case of
illness.

16. If any bishop shall be patron of the benefice or of any ecclesiastical preferment held by the incumbent respecting whom a representation shall have been made, or shall be unable from illness to discharge any of the duties imposed upon him by this Act in regard to any representation, the archbishop of the province shall act in the place of such bishop in all matters thereafter arising in relation to such representation; and if any archbishop shall be patron of the benefice or of any ecclesiastical preferment held by the incumbent respecting whom a representation shall have been made, or shall be unable from illness to discharge any of the duties imposed upon him by this Act in regard to any representation, Her Majesty may, by Her Sign Manual, appoint an archbishop or bishop to act in the place of such archbishop in all matters thereafter arising in relation to such representation.

Provisions
relating to
cathedral
or colle-
giate
church.

17. The duties appointed under this Act to be performed by the bishop of the diocese shall in the case of a cathedral or collegiate church be performed by the visitor thereof.

If any complaint shall be made concerning the fabric, ornaments, furniture, or decorations of a cathedral or collegiate church, the person complained of shall be the dean and chapter of such cathedral or collegiate church, and in the event of obedience not being rendered to a monition relating to the fabric, ornaments, furniture, or decorations of such cathedral or collegiate church, the visitor or the judge, as the case may be, shall have power to carry into effect the directions contained in such monition, and, if necessary, to raise the sum required to defray the cost thereof by sequestration of the profits of the preferments held in such cathedral or collegiate church by the dean and chapter thereof.

If any complaint shall be made concerning the ornaments of the minister in a cathedral or collegiate church, or as to the observance therein of the directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer, relating to the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the said book, or as to any alleged addition to, alteration of, or omission from such services, rites, and ceremonies in such cathedral or collegiate church, the person complained of shall be the clerk in holy orders alleged to have offended in the matter complained of; and the visitor or the judge, as the case may be, in the event of obedience not being rendered to a monition, shall have the same power as to inhibition, and the preferment held in such cathedral or collegiate church by the person complained of shall be subject to the same conditions as to avoidance, notice, and lapse, and as to any subsequent appointment, presentation, collation, or nomination thereto, and as to due provision being made for the performance of the duties of such person, as are contained in this Act concerning an incumbent to whom a monition has been issued, and concerning any benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment held by such incumbent.

18. When a sentence has been pronounced by consent, or any suit or proceeding has been commenced against any incumbent under the Act of the third and fourth year of the reign of Her Majesty, chapter eighty-six, he shall not be liable to proceedings under this Act in respect of the same matter; and no incumbent proceeded against under this Act shall be liable to proceedings under the said Act of the third and fourth year of the reign of Her Majesty, in respect of any matter upon which judgment has been pronounced under this Act.

19. Her Majesty may by Order in Council, at any time either before or after the commencement of this Act, by and with the advice of the Lord High Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice of England, the judge to be appointed under this Act, and the archbishops and bishops who are members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, or any two of the said persons, one of them being the Lord High Chancellor or the Lord Chief Justice of England, cause rules and orders to be made for regulating the procedure and settling the fees to be taken in proceedings under the same Act, so far as the

A.D. 1874.

Limitation
of pro-
ceedings
against
incumbent.Rules for
settling
procedure
and fees
under this
Act.

A.D. 1874. same may not be expressly regulated by this Act, and from time to time alter or amend such rules and orders. All rules and orders made in pursuance of this section shall be laid before each House of Parliament within forty days after the same are made, if Parliament is then sitting, or if not, within forty days after the then next meeting of Parliament; and if an address is presented to Her Majesty by either of the said Houses within the next subsequent forty days on which the House shall have sat praying that any such rules may be annulled, Her Majesty may thereupon by Order in Council annul the same, and the rules and orders so annulled shall thenceforth become void, without prejudice to the validity of any proceeding already taken under the same.

SCHEDULES referred to in the foregoing Act.

SCHEDULE (A.)

I do hereby solemnly declare that I am a member of the Church of England as by law established.

Witness my hand this day of

SCHEDULE (B.)

"PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT, 1874."

To the Right Rev. Father in God, *A.*, by Divine permission Lord Bishop of *B.*

I, [We,] *C.D.*, Archdeacon of the archdeaconry of _____, [or a churchwarden or three parishioners of the parish of *E.*,] in your Lordship's diocese, do hereby represent that [*the person or persons complained of*] has or have [*state the matter to be represented; if more than one, then under separate heads*].

Dated this day of 18 .

(Signed) *C.D.*

To be obtained at the Office of the Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London.
By Subscribers, for distribution, free. By others at the price of 8d per dozen, or 4s 6d per 100.

DISTINCTIVE VESTMENTS.

BY THE

REV. CANON J. C. RYLE,

Vicar of Stradbroke.

WHAT is the meaning of the expression which heads this paper? What are these "*distinctive vestments*," about which there is so much controversy among Churchmen? Are they of any real importance? Ought they to be formally sanctioned or not? To these questions it is proposed in this paper to supply an answer.

"Distinctive Vestments," then, are certain articles of ministerial dress, which some clergymen wish to be allowed to wear in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and declare they cannot be satisfied unless they are allowed. It is asserted that these vestments are specially and peculiarly connected with the office which the clergyman performs in that sacrament, and that he ought to be allowed to wear them in that part of his ministrations, if in no other.

Now, what are these famous "Vestments" to which such importance is attached? It may be useful to have our minds clearly informed about this. A surplice, a hood, and a scarf, most people understand. But what are these "*distinctive vestments*?" They are described in the *Directorium Anglicanum*, and in Dr. Blakeney's admirable work on the Prayer Book, a book which every faithful Churchman ought to read in the present day. The three principal

vestments are these: 1. *The alb*: a linen garment, fitting close to the body, reaching to the feet, and bound with a girdle. 2. *The chasuble*: a silken robe, worn over the alb, richly embroidered, and open in front. 3. *The cope*: a garment of a circular form, something like a poncho, with an opening for the head, cut out at the sides for the arms, leaving a straight pendent piece behind and before. Such are the articles of dress which are disturbing the Church of England at the present time. Such is the apparel which many tell us is almost essential for the right celebration of the Lord's Supper. Such are the "distinctive vestments," which, it is commonly reported, many *members of Convocation are actually prepared to advise Parliament to sanction!*

Now the grave question which I want all faithful Churchmen in this day to consider is this:—Is there any real objection to these articles of dress being worn by those clergymen who like them, in celebrating the Lord's Supper? Is there any good and solid reason why clergymen, who, beside a surplice, a hood, and a scarf, wish to wear an alb, a chasuble, and a cope, should not be allowed to wear them? Let us see.

The first idea of many innocent and simple-minded Churchmen is to let every clergyman do as he likes, and to allow the widest liberty and toleration.—“Where is the use,” they say, “of making such a stir about a mere question of outward apparel? Why not let people alone, if they are earnest and hard-working clergymen? Why not allow them to indulge their taste? What can it really signify in the end? How can a few chasubles, and copes, and albs do any harm to the Church of England?”—To all who talk and think in this way I venture to offer a few plain facts about these “vestments,” which cannot be disputed, and I invite them to consider them well. Most of them are historical facts, which any intelligent reader can verify for himself. I challenge all who are disposed to make light of the “vestment” question, to look these facts fairly in the face.

1. It is a fact that there is not the slightest proof in Scripture, that any “distinctive vestments” were worn, or considered necessary for the due celebration of the Lord's Supper, in the days of the

Apostles. These "vestments" are purely and entirely an invention of a later age and of uninspired men. The gorgeous dress of the high-priest in the Mosaic dispensation was never meant to be a pattern to the Christian Church. It was part of a typical system, which was ordained for a special purpose, and was intended to pass away.

2. It is a fact that the use of these "distinctive vestments" is one of the many distinctive marks of the Church of Rome. That unhappy Church connects them closely with that crowning error and blasphemous delusion in her theological system—the sacrifice of the Mass!

3. It is a fact that in the beginning of the English Reformation, when our Reformers were only half enlightened, the use of these distinctive vestments was expressly ordered. The first Prayer Book of Edward the VIth, put forth in 1549, contains the following words in the rubric before the Communion Service:—"The priest shall put upon him the vestment appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, that is to say, a white alb plain, with a vestment or cope."

4. It is a fact that, as soon as our Reformers saw Scriptural truth fully and clearly, they expressly forbade the clergy to use these "distinctive vestments." The second Prayer Book of Edward the VIth, put forth in 1552, contains the following words at the beginning of the morning service, "The priest shall wear neither alb, vestment, nor cope,—but he shall have and wear a surplice only."

5. It is a fact that when the English Reformation was begun over again in the difficult days of Elizabeth, after Bloody Mary's destructive reign, the only rubric put forth about the ministers' dress, expressly omits to mention the "distinctive vestments," and only directs, in vague and general language, "such ornaments to be used as were in use in the second year of Edward VI."—But that these "ornaments" did not mean the famous Popish "vestments," as some assert now-a-days, is made as nearly certain as possible by two historical facts. One is, that in the first year of her reign, Elizabeth issued "injunctions" ordering ministers to "wear such seemly habits as

were most commonly received in the LATTER DAYS of King Edward VI."—The other is, that in 1564, the Queen issued "advertisements," in which it is ordered that "every minister saying prayers or administering sacraments shall wear a comely surplice." Neither in the injunctions or advertisements are the alb, the cope, or the chasuble mentioned.—*Cardwell's Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 193, 292.

6. It is a fact that in 1569, Archbishop Parker, the first primate under Elizabeth, issued "Articles of inquiry" for the whole province of Canterbury, containing the following question:—"Whether your priests, curates, or ministers do use in the times of the celebration of divine service to wear a surplice, as prescribed by the Queen's injunctions and the book of Common Prayer."—*Cardwell's Documentary Annals*, vol. i. 321.

7. It is a fact that in 1576 Archbishop Grindal, the second primate under Elizabeth, issued "articles of inquiry" for the whole province of Canterbury, in which he expressly asks "whether all vestments, albs, tunicles, &c., and such other relics and monuments of superstition and idolatry, be utterly defaced, broken and destroyed."—Parker Society, *Grindal's Remains*, p. 159. The same inquiry was made by Aylmer, Bishop of London in 1577, and by Sandys, Archbishop of York in 1578. Whether it is in the least likely that such an imperious Sovereign as Queen Elizabeth would have allowed such inquiries to be made, if the "ornaments rubric" legalized the vestments, is a question I leave to any one of common sense to answer!

8. It is a fact that the Canons of 1604 say nothing about "distinctive vestments," as essential to the due celebration of the Lord's Supper. The 58th canon simply orders that "Every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice." This canon is the more remarkable, because the 24th canon orders the cope to be worn "in cathedrals" by those who administer the communion. However much we may regret that the "cope" is sanctioned in cathedrals, it must be remembered that the chasuble and not the cope, is peculiarly the sacrificial garment. The use of the chasuble is not ordered.

9. It is a fact that at the last revision of our Prayer Book, in the year 1662, nothing whatever was done to restore the "distinctive vestments," and not a word was added to our rubrics that could justify the use of them.

10. It is a fact that for nearly three hundred years these "distinctive vestments" have never been used in the parish churches of the Church of England. Whatever some men may please to say, in the present day, about the lawfulness of alb, chasuble or cope, there is no getting over the fact that all *custom* is dead against them, and that from the first days of Queen Elizabeth they have been disused and laid aside.

11. It is a fact that the attempt to revive the use of "distinctive vestments," in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, is a thing of entirely modern date. It began with a party in the Church, which boldly avows its desire to unprotestantize the Church of England. It is pressed forward and supported almost entirely by those churchmen who, both in doctrine and practice, are making unmistakeable approaches toward the Church of Rome, and regard the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice.

12. Last, but not least, it is a fact that the principal advocates of the Ritualistic movement in the Church of England, distinctly and expressly avow that the "distinctive vestments" in the Lord's Supper are not taken up and pressed upon us as a mere matter of taste, but as *sacrificial garments* and the outward expression of an inward doctrine. That doctrine is nothing less than the Romish doctrine of a real corporal presence, a real sacrifice, a really sacrificing priest, and a real altar in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. That this is the fact any one may satisfy himself by reading the evidence of Mr. Bennett, the Vicar of Frome, given before the Royal Commissioners in 1867, (First report, p. 72.) Mr. Bennett, in reply to a question, distinctly told the Commissioners that "the use of the chasuble involved the doctrine of sacrifice," and that "he considered he offered a propitiatory sacrifice in the Lord's Supper."

I lay these twelve facts before my readers, and commend them to their serious attention. I entreat them to mark, learn, and inwardly

digest them. I unhesitatingly assert, in the face of these facts, that it is impossible to defend the use of the "distinctive vestments" in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, either by Scripture, the Prayer Book, the law of the land, or custom. Reason and common sense alike condemn them. I assert furthermore that it is no trifling matter to allow any clergyman to use these vestments, that the allowance will be the concession of a great principle, and that any effort that may be made, either in Convocation or Parliament, to obtain sanction for them, ought to be firmly resisted by every faithful Churchman.

I now call on every one who really loves the Church of England to use every effort to prevent "distinctive vestments" being sanctioned by the law of the land. If any doubting, hesitating, peace-loving Churchman asks me why, I offer him the following reasons :

(a.) Because the "distinctive vestments" are utterly without warrant of Scripture, are not in the slightest degree essential to the due celebration of the Lord's Supper, and are not of the slightest use to the souls of Christian worshippers.

(b.) Because the "distinctive vestments" were deliberately rejected and expressly forbidden by the English Reformers at the brightest period of the Reformation, and to sanction the use of them again would be an insult to the memory of the very men who were martyred at Oxford and Smithfield.

(c.) Because the Church of England has done well enough without the "distinctive vestments" for three hundred years, and at the present time does not need more "ornaments," but more preaching the Gospel and more holy living among its ministers.

(d.) Because the immense majority of the laity do not want the "distinctive vestments" to be worn by the clergy, and are quite satisfied with the customary surplice and hood. They wish for no innovation in the dress of ministers, and are likely to regard the sanction of them with annoyance and disgust. In short, the "vestments" may bring on secession, disruption and disestablishment.

(e.) Because the "distinctive vestments" are avowedly connected

with one of the worst and most dangerous doctrines of the Church of Rome—viz., the sacrifice of the mass; and the sanction of them would therefore be displeasing to God, because highly dishonouring to the priestly office and finished work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(f.) Because the adoption of the “distinctive vestments” is justly calculated to give great offence to the whole body of English non-conformists, and is likely to alienate them more and more from the Established Church, and to render reunion and comprehension impossible.

(g.) Because the sanction of the “distinctive vestments” would be a public declaration to the whole world, that the clergy of the Church of England wish to go back from the pure and Scriptural principles of Protestantism, on which the Church was first established, and to make a nearer approach to the Church of Rome, from which their forefathers seceded. In short, the “vestments” are a direct retrograde step towards Popery.

(h.) Because the sanction of “distinctive vestments” will more than ever separate the clergy of the Church of England into two opposing parties—those who wear sacrificial garments at the Lord’s table, and those who do not wear them. So far from the liberty to wear them promoting peace, it will only increase and multiply our “unhappy divisions.”

(i.) Because the sanction of “distinctive vestments” will only please a small minority of restless Churchmen, who have long avowed their dislike to Protestantism, while it will seriously offend that large mass of English people who are deeply attached to the principles of the Reformation.

For these reasons I now call on all Churchmen who love the old Church of England, on all English Christians who love Christ, on all who dislike priestcraft or sacerdotalism, to unite as one man in resisting the efforts now being made to obtain a legal sanction for the use of “distinctive vestments” in the Established Church, at the Lord’s Supper. For peace sake let us be ready to concede much. On indifferent matters let us allow the utmost liberty to men’s consciences. But we must never give up Christ’s truth.—If any persons

want to have the sacrament of the Lord's Supper formally declared to be a sacrifice, or want a sacrificial dress to be formally legalised at the Communion table of the Church of England, let us resolve firmly, that we will never, never, never consent.—Let our common watchword throughout England and Wales be this,—a Protestant Established Church, or else no Established Church at all! No compromise with Popery, whatever be the consequence! No peace with Rome! Those that want “the mass” ought to go outside the Church of England.

J. C. RYLE.

PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT ON VESTMENTS.

Extract from the Judgment in HEBBERT *v.* PURCHAS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, Lord Hatherley, in delivering Judgment, Feb. 23, 1871, said,

The charges which are the subject of this appeal, are that the Respondent has offended against the Statute Law and the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, . . . by himself wearing and sanctioning and authorizing the wearing by other officiating Ministers, whilst officiating in the Communion Service, and in the administration of the Holy Communion in the said church, a Vestment called a *Chasuble*, as pleaded in the 36th Article; and by himself wearing, and causing or suffering to be worn by other officiating Clergy, when officiating in the Communion Service in the said Church, certain other vestments called *Dalmatics*, *Tunics* or *Tunicles*, and *Albs*. . .

We find it convenient to adopt the order followed by the learned Dean of the Arches, and to examine first, the charge of wearing and causing to be worn, a *Chasuble*, *Tunics*, or *Tunicles* and *Albs* in the celebration of the Holy Communion.

It is necessary to review shortly the history of the Rubric, usually known as "the Ornaments-Rubric," which governs this question.

The first Prayer Book of King *Edward VI.*, 1549, contains the following Rubric at the beginning of the Communion office:—

"Upon the day, and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the Priest, that shall execute the Holy

ministry, shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say: a white Albe, plain, with a Vestment or Cope. And where there may be many Priests or Deacons, there so many shall be ready to help the Priest in the ministration, as shall be requisite; and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, Albes with Tunicles."

In the second Prayer Book of *Edward VI.* (A.D. 1552) this was altered, and it was ordered that the Minister "shall use neither Albe, Vestment, nor Cope: but being archbishop, or bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet, and being a Priest or Deacon he shall have and wear a surplice only."

The Prayer Book of *Elizabeth* (A.D. 1559) provided that "the Minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King *Edward VI.* according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this Book."

This Committee has already decided in *Westerton v. Liddell*, that the words "by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King *Edward VI.*," refer to the first Prayer Book of King *Edward VI.*

The Act of Parliament set in the beginning of *Elizabeth's* Book is Queen *Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity*, (1 Eliz. c. 2), and the 25th clause of that Act contains a proviso, "That such Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in Use, as was in this Church of *England* by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King *Edward the Sixth*, until other Order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the Commissioners appointed and authorised under the Great Seal of *England*, for causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm."

The Prayer Book, therefore, refers to the Act, and the Act clearly contemplated further directions to be given by the Queen, with the advice of Commissioners or of the Metropolitan. It was not, apparently, thought desirable to effect an immediate outward change of ceremonies, although the adoption of the second Prayer Book of *Edward VI.*, in lieu of the first, had effected a great change in the very substance of the Communion Service, with which the theory of

the peculiar vestments (the *Alb* and *Chasuble*) was closely connected.

The Rubric and the proviso together seem to restore for the present, the Ornaments of the Minister which the second Prayer Book of King *Edward* had taken away. But *Sandys*, afterwards Archbishop of *York*, who assisted at the revision of the Prayer Book, gives to Archbishop *Parker* a different suggestion: "Our gloss upon this text," he says, "is, that we shall not be forced to use them (the Ornaments), but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they shall remain for the Queen." (*Burnet's Reformation*, Vol. ii., Records, p. 332.) The Injunctions of *Elizabeth* appeared in the same year, 1559; and the 47th orders "That the Churchwardens of every Parish shall deliver unto the Visitors the inventories of Vestments, Copes, and other Ornaments, plate, Books, and specially of grails, couchers, legends, processional, hymnals, manuals, portasses, and such like appertaining to the Church." (*Cardwell*, Doc. Ann. I. p. 196 [Ed. 1839]). The Commissioners began to carry out these Injunctions in the same year. One of their returns is in the Record Office (Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1547-1580, p. 148), which shews that they chiefly occupied themselves in taking inventories of Church Ornaments, and of the Service Books in use.

In the year 1564 appeared the Advertisements of *Elizabeth*. They make order for the vesture of the Minister in these words:—"In the ministration of the Holy Communion in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the principal Minister shall wear a *Cope*, with Gospeler and Epistoler agreeably and at all other prayers to be said at the Communion Table to use no Copes but Surplices."

"That every minister, saying any public prayers or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely *Surplice* with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." (*Cardwell*, Doc. Ann. I. 326.)

These Advertisements were very actively enforced within a few years of their publication. An inventory of the Ornaments of 150 parishes in the Diocese of Lincoln, A.D. 1565-1566, has been published by Mr. *Edward Peacock*; and it shews, that the *Chasubles* or Vestments and the *Albs*, were systematically defaced, destroyed, or put to other uses, and a precise account was rendered of the mode of their destruction. Proceedings took place under Commissions in

4

Lancashire in 1565 and 1570; in *Carlisle* in 1573, and following years, when "Vestments seem to have disappeared altogether." (Rev. J. Raine, on "Vestments," *London*, 1866.) There is no reason to doubt, that all through the Country commissions were issued to enforce the observance of the Advertisements, within a few years after they were drawn up.

The Visitation Articles of the Archbishops and Bishops about this time, shew that the operation of the Advertisements had been rapid and complete. Archbishop *Grindal* in 1571, inquires "whether all Vestments, Albs, Tunicles, stoles, phanons, pixes, paxes, hand-bells, sacring-bells, censers, crismatories, crosses, candlesticks, holy water stocks, images, and such other reliques and monuments of superstition and idolatrie be utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed" (Rit. Com., 2nd Rep. Appx. p. 408). Archbishop *Parker*, in 1575, asks "in the time of celebration of Divine service whether they wear Surplices," (Rit. Com., 2nd Rep. Appx. p. 416). *Aylmer*, Bishop of *London*, uses the same form of question as Archbishop *Grindal* (Ibid. p. 418b); *Sandys*, Archbishop of *York*, inquired, in 1578, "whether your Parson, Vicar, or Curate, at all times in saying the Common Prayer upon Sunday and holidays, and in administering of the Sacrament, doth use and retain the Surplice, yea or nay." (Ibid. p. 422a.)

Upon the whole, there is abundant evidence, that within a few years after the Advertisements were issued, the vestments used in the Mass entirely disappeared.

It is true that for some years after the appearance of the Advertisements, great reluctance was exhibited by the Puritan party to the use of the *Surplice*, and in the struggle against the use, they sometimes asserted that, if the *Surplice* were insisted upon, then, by virtue of the Rubric and Act of Parliament, the other vestments mentioned in the First Prayer Book of *Edward VI.* should also be used.

In a somewhat rare Tract, printed in the reign of *James I.*, 1605, and addressed to the Bishop of *Worcester*, defending "the not exact use of the authorized Book of Common Prayer," the Writer (p. 34) argues, that no such order was made by the Queen as was directed by the Act of Parliament, yet even he admits that the Metropolitan, "on the Queen's mandative Letters that some order might be taken, had conference and communication, and at the last, by assent and

consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, did think such orders as were specified in the Advertisements meet and convenient to be used and followed," (p. 36) ; but he asserts that they were of no value, since "the Queen's assent was not yielded."

This last proposition can hardly be maintained ; for if the Queen's mandative Letter preceded the compilation of the Advertisements, and if, as it appears abundantly, they were afterwards enforced as by her authority, her assent must be presumed. It appears probable that the Queen hesitated before the advertisements were thus enforced ; as to which see a remarkable letter from the Archbishop to *Cecil*, on the 28th of March, 1566, cited by Mr. *Perry* in his Book on "Lawful Church Ornaments," (p. 209), from the *Parker* Correspondence, on which Mr. *Perry* remarks, "It would seem that the Archbishop's application had at length some success, for immediately afterwards he sent his letter to the Bishop of *London* for conformity," and in the letter to the Bishop he requests him "to transmit the book of Advertisements to the other Suffragans of the Province."

But, as has been said, the contemporaneous evidence as to the abolition of all vestments obnoxious to the Puritan party (other than the Surplice, hood, and tippet, and the square cap) is abundant.

In a scarce book, called "A Part of a Register," in which is a considerable number of documents collected by those who objected to Church Ritual, the complaint is uniformly against Copes and Surplices. Thus, in a letter by A. G., 1570, p. 13, he complains of "crossing, coping, and surplensing." A Report of the Examination of *Smith*, *Nixon*, and others, before the Lord Mayor, the Bishop of *London*, and other Commissioners, 1567, p. 28, describes *Hawkins*, one of the accused, as saying, "Surplusses and Copes be superstitious and idolatrous." *Ireland*, another of them, (p. 32) says to the Bishop, "But you go like one of the Mass Priests still ;" to which the Bishop replies, "You see me wear a cope or a surpluss at Paul's. I had rather minister without these things, but for order's sake and for obedience to the Prince."

In another of these documents, called "A View of Antichrist, his Laws and Ceremonies," there is a careful enumeration of ornaments complained of as Popish, not mentioning Alb, nor Chasuble ; but (p. 63) there is mention of "the Cap, the Tippet, the Surplice for small Churches, the Cope for great Churches, furred Hoods in summer for the great Doctors, silken hoods in their quiers upon a

Surpiesse, and the grey amise with the catte's tails." This mention of the amise is the only notice in the many tracts collected in the Register of any specific Vestment, other than the Surplice and Cope being worn. But in the same book is contained "A Letter by Master *Robert Johnson* to Master *Edwin Sandys* (1573)," in which at p. 104, he says, "You must yield some reason why the Tippet is commended and the Stole forbidden; why the Vestment is put away and the Cope retained; why the Alb is laid aside and the Surplice is used; or why the Chalice is forbidden in the Bishop of *Canterbury's* Articles, or the grey amice, by the Canon more than the rest, why have they offended, &c." *Edward Dering* (1593) in another Tract in the same Book, speaks of the grey amice having been especially forbidden in the "Book of the Discipline of the Church of *England*." He goes on to say that other Vestments, equally superstitious, are used; and in a passage immediately before this he asks, "how he can subscribe to the ceremonies in Cathedral Churches, where they have the Priest, Dean, and Sub-dean in Copes and Vestments all as before;" but that he is alluding in this to the Cope and Surplice is plain, both from the before cited statement of the Bishop of *London* to *Hawkins*, and from the question in *Johnson's* tract, "Why the Vestment is put away and the Cope retained, the Alb laid aside and the Surplice in use;" and the enumeration of Popish Ornaments in "The View of Antichrist."

Now all the Tracts above cited are dated within ten years after the date of the Advertisements, and the complaints so bitterly made as to the Cope and Surplice, would certainly have been extended to the *Alb*, and *Chasuble*, had they not then ceased to exist.

In the correspondence with Foreign Reformers, called the "*Zurich* Letters," the controversy is treated as having become confined to the Cope and Surplice.

At the *Hampton Court* Conference the Puritans objected to the Surplice, as "a kind of Garment which the Priests of *Isis* used to wear," (*Cardwell*, Conferences, p. 200). There was evidently no other Vestment in use to which they could object. The revised Prayer Book, issued soon after, retained the Ornaments-Rubric in the same form as in the Prayer Book of Queen *Elizabeth*. The Canons of 1603-4, enacted by both Convocations, and ratified by the King's consent, sanctioned the use of this Prayer Book. But whilst thus implicitly sanctioning the Ornaments-Rubric, the Canons also provide specially for the vesture of the Minister. Canon 24 directs

the use of "a decent Cope," for the principal Minister in the Holy Communion in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, "according to the Advertisements published anno 7 *Elizabeth*;" and Canon 58 directs that "every Minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall use a decent and comely Surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the Parish."

Their Lordships think it needless to adduce authorities to shew that there was no attempt to revive or use the *Chasuble*, *Alb*, and *Tunicle* between the years 1604 and 1662.

The Ornaments-Rubric of 1662 is as follows:—

"*And here is to be noted, that such Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward VI.*" The form of this Rubric is different from that of the preceding Prayer Book, and follows, for the most part, the wording of the proviso of the Act of Queen *Elizabeth*.

The learned Judge in the Court below assumes that the Puritan party at the *Savoy* Conference objected to this Rubric; whereas it was the Rubric of *James* that they were discussing. Upon that, the Puritans observed that, "Inasmuch as this Rubric seemeth to bring back the Cope, Alb, and other Vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6 *Edward VI.*, and so for reasons alleged against ceremonies under our eighteenth general exception, we deem it may be wholly left out." The Rubric had been in force for nearly sixty years, and they do not allege that the Vestments had been brought back; nor would a total omission of the Rubric have been a protection against them. The Bishops in their answer shew that they understand the Surplice to be in question, and not the Vestments. (*Cardwell*, *Conferences*, pp. 314, 345, 351.) But the learned Judge through this oversight, has overlooked the most important part of the proceedings. The Bishops determined that the Rubric "should continue as it is." But after this they did, in fact, re-cast it entirely. It must not be assumed that alterations made under such circumstances were made without thought, and are of no importance. The Rubric had directed the Minister to "use at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministrations," the ornaments in question. The Statute of *Elizabeth* did not direct such use, nor

refer to any special times of ministration, but it ordered simply the retaining of the ornaments till further order made by the Queen. The Bishops threw aside the form of the old Rubric and adopted that of the Statute of *Elizabeth*, but added the words "at all times of their ministration," without the words which had in all former Rubrics distinguished the Holy Communion from other ministrations; a mode of expression more suitable to a state of things wherein the Vestments for all ministrations had become the same. The change also brought in the word "retained," which, it has been argued, would not include things already obsolete. Whatever be the force of these two arguments, the fact is clear that the Puritans objected to a Rubric differing from this; and that after their objections the Rubric was re-cast, and brought into its present form.

With regard to the suggestion attributed to the House of Lords, "whether the Rubric should not be mended where all Vestments in time of Divine Service are now commanded which were used by *Edward VI.*" ("Cardwell, Conferences," p. 274), the learned Judge has overlooked the fact that this applies to the earlier Rubric; and the suggestion did not emanate from the House of Lords, nor was it ever adopted by that body. And the learned Judge omits to observe, that the Rubric of *James*, which was objected to, was amended after the suggestion.

From the passing of the *Act of Uniformity* there is abundant evidence to show that the Vestments in question were not used at all. Their Lordships may refer to the various Visitation Articles published in the Second Report of the Ritual Commission and elsewhere, as showing that the *Surplice* alone was to be used, and that deviations from that rule were on the side of defect, and not in the direction of returning to the Vestments of the Mass. Some of these Articles were published by *Bishop Cosin* and others, who took part in the revision of the Prayer Book. In the Sixth Article *Bishop Cosin* inquires, "Have you a large and decent Surplice (one or more) for the Minister to wear at all times of his publick ministration in the Church?" (Rit. Com. 2nd Rep., Appx. p. 601*b*.) This repetition of the words at all times of his ministration, the exact words of the Rubric, is very significant as a contemporaneous exposition of it by one of its framers.

These, then, are the leading historical facts with which we have to deal in the difficult task of construing the Rubric of Ornaments.

The *Vestment*, or *Cope*, *Alb*, and *Tunicle* were ordered by the First Prayer Book of *Edward VI.* They were abolished by the Prayer Book of 1552, and the Surplice was substituted. They were provisionally restored by the Statute of *Elizabeth*, and by her Prayer Book of 1559. But the Injunctions and the Advertisements of *Elizabeth* established a new order within a few years from the passing of the Statute, under which *Chasuble*, *Alb*, and *Tunicle* disappeared. The Canons of 1603-4, adopting anew the reference to the Rubric of *Edward VI.*, sanctioned in express terms all that the Advertisements had done in the matter of the Vestments, and ordered the *Surplice* only to be used in Parish Churches. The revisers of our present Prayer Book in 1662, under another form of words, repeated the reference to the second year of *Edward VI.*, and they did so advisedly, after attention had been called to the possibility of a return to the Vestments.

The authority of the Advertisements has been questioned on the ground that it has never been shown that they received the assent of the Queen. Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the Advertisements did not receive the official assent of the Queen, but were acted upon under a number of Royal Commissions, and with the approval of the Metropolitan, their Lordships think that this was a "taking other order" within the meaning of the statute; 1 Eliz. c. 2, s. 25. There is no doubt that the Advertisements were carried into effect as legally binding, and were enforced by Royal Commissions. There is no doubt that they were accepted, in some cases by reluctant people, as of legal obligation; and their authority is expressly recognised by the Twenty-fourth Canon of 1603-4.

In the case of *Macdougall v. Purrier* (4 Bligh's Reports, H. L. Cases (N. C.), 433), the House of Lords presumed the enrolment in Chancery of a Decree of Commissioners appointed by an Act of *Henry VIII.*, for settling the Tithes in *London*, although no such enrolment could be found, on the principle that where instruments have been long acted on, and acquiesced in by parties interested in opposing their effect, all formalities shall be presumed to have been observed. No special form of consulting the Metropolitan is prescribed to the Queen.

Their Lordships are now called on to determine the force of the Rubric of 1662, and its effect upon other regulations, such as the

Canons of 1603-4. They do not disguise from themselves that the task is difficult.

The learned Judge in the Court below, has said that "the plain words of the Statute, according to the ordinary principles of interpretation, and the construction which they have received in two judgments of the Privy Council, oblige me to pronounce that the Ornaments of the Minister, mentioned in the First Prayer Book of *Edward VI.*, are those to which the present Rubric referred." (Law Rep., 3 A. and E., p. 94.) "They are, for Ministers below the order of Bishops, and when officiating at the Communion Service, *Cope, Vestment* or *Chasuble, Surplice, Alb, and Tunicle*; in all other services the Surplice only, except that in Cathedral Churches and Colleges the academical hood may be also worn." He considers that the object of the Advertisements of *Elizabeth* "was to secure as great an amount of decent Ritual as the circumstances of the time would permit."

"As to the Visitation Articles," from the time of the Statute of *Charles II.*, the learned Judge observes, "the same principle applies to them as to the Advertisements and Canons, and, indeed, as to every attempt to procure a decent Ritual since Queen *Elizabeth's* time; namely, that the authorities were content to order the minimum of what was requisite for this purpose." (Law Rep. 3 A. and E. 90.) Remarking upon the question, whether the consent of the King to the Canons of 1603-4 could be held to be an execution of the powers given to the Queen by the statute of *Elizabeth*, the learned Judge, after some comments which their Lordships do not feel called on to examine, says "a subsequent Statute, which expressly revived a prior Statute inconsistent with the Advertisements of *Elizabeth* would, by necessary implication, repeal them." (Law Rep. 3 A. and E. 87.)

The Committee is unable to accept this interpretation of the Advertisements and the Visitation Articles as the true one. Their Lordships think that the defacing and destroying, and converting to profane and other uses, of all the Vestments now in question, as described in the *Lincoln MS.* published by Mr. *Peacock*, shew a determination to remove utterly these ornaments, and not to leave them to be used hereafter when higher Ritual might become possible. They think that the inquiries of *Sandys* and *Aylmer* already quoted, shew that the *Surplice* was not to be the least or lowest, but the

only Vestment of the parochial Clergy. They think that the Articles of Visitation (cited, Rit. Com., 2nd Rep. Appx.) issued at and after the passing of the *Act of Uniformity*, which ask after the "fair Surplice for the Minister to wear at all times of his ministration," without any suggestion of any other vestment, could scarcely have been put forth by Bishops desirous of a more elaborate Ritual, and aware that the Vestments were now of statutable obligation. They think that in prescribing the Surplice only, the Advertisements meant what they said, the Surplice only; and that strong steps were taken to ensure that only the Surplice should be used.

Their Lordships remark further, that the doctrine of a minimum of Ritual represented by the Surplice, with a maximum represented by a return to the mediæval Vestments, is inconsistent with the fact that the Rubric is a positive order, under a penal Statute, accepted by each Clergyman in a remarkably strong expression of "assent and consent," and capable of being enforced with severe penalties. It is not to be assumed, without proof, that such a statute was framed so as to leave a choice between contrary interpretations, in a question that had ever been regarded as momentous, and had stirred, as the learned Judge remarks, some of the strongest passions of man. Historically all the communications between Archbishop *Parker* and the Queen, and her Government, indicate a strong desire for uniformity, and the Articles of Visitation after 1662 were all framed with the like object. If the Minister is ordered to wear a *Surplice* at all times of his ministration, he cannot wear an *Alb* and *Tunicle* when assisting at the Holy Communion; if he is to celebrate the Holy Communion in a *Chasuble*, he cannot celebrate in a *Surplice*.

In order to decide the question before the Committee, it seems desirable first to examine the effect of the Church legislation of 1603-4. The 14th Canon orders the use of the Prayer Book without omission or innovation, and the 80th Canon directs that copies of the Prayer Book are to be provided, in its latest revised form, and, by implication, the Ornaments-Rubric is thus made binding on the Clergy. Canon 24th directs the use of the Cope in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches upon principal Feast days, "according to the Advertisements for this end, anno 7 *Elizabeth*." Canon 58th says that "every Minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely Surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." There can be no doubt that the intention here was not to set up a con-

tradictory rule, by prescribing Vestments in the Prayer Book, and a Surplice in the Canons, which give authority to the Prayer Book. It could not be intended, in recognising the legal force of the Advertisements, to bring back the things which the Advertisements had taken away, nor could it be expected that either Minister or People should provide Vestments in lieu of those which had been destroyed, and accordingly no direction is given with regard to them. The provisions of the Canons and Prayer Book must be read together, as far as possible, and the Canons upon the vesture of the Ministers must be held to be an exposition and limitation of the Rubric of Ornaments. Such Ornaments are to be used as were in use in the second year of *Edward VI.*, limited as to the Vestments, by the special provisions of the Canons themselves; and the contemporaneous exposition of universal practice, shew that this was regarded as the meaning of the Canons. There does not appear to have been any return to the Vestments in any quarter whatever.

The Act of 1662 sanctioned a Prayer Book with a different Rubric, but it referred back to the second of King *Edward VI.*, and in some sense or other revived the Rubric of King *Edward's* First Book; the question is, in what sense, and in what degree. There seems to be three opinions on this point.

One, that the Act of 1662 repealed all legislation on the subject of the Ornaments of the Minister; the second, that the Act and the Canons set up two distinct standards of Ritual on this subject; and the third, that the Act of 1662 is to be read with the Canons of 1602 still in force, and harmonised with them.

I. The first is that expressed by Dr. *Lushington*, Judge of the Consistory Court, in the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*, (Moore's Special Report, p. 32.) that in reviving the Rubric of 1549 the Act of 1662 excluded and repealed all provisions whatever of Act of Parliament or Canon which had been made after 1549 and prior to 1662. This view was adopted by Sir *John Dodson*, Dean of the Arches Court, in the same case, when it reached the Arches Court. The consequence of this must be, that every celebration of the Holy Communion in a *Surplice* only, from 1662 to the present day, would be a violation of the Statute. The Canons of 1603-4 being repealed as to this matter, together with the Advertisements on which the Canons were built, there would be no legal warrant for using the *Surplice* and omitting to use the *Vestments* at the Holy Communion. Yet there is no doubt of the practice.

For 180 years the Vestment was never worn. And thus there would be the unusual occurrence of a Statute repealing former legislation, and fortified with heavy penalties, which was systematically broken, not only by one and all of those who had declared their unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, but by the framers of the Rubric themselves immediately after the confirmation of it by Act of Parliament. Nor is there during that time one single instance of calling to account or censuring anyone for his particular share in a universal violation of the law. It appears plain to their Lordships from these facts that the idea of the repealing power of this Rubric is a modern one.

But the 24th clause of the *Act of Uniformity* (13 and 14 Car. II. c. 4) shews, that it was not the intention of the passers of the Act to repeal past laws. It provides that "the several good Laws and Statutes of this realm which have been formerly made, and are now in force, for the uniformity of Prayer and the administration of the Sacraments . . . shall stand in full force and strength, to all intents and purposes whatever, for the establishing and confirming the said Book." The laws were to remain; but they were to bear on the new Book of Common Prayer, and not upon any former one. Now, the Prayer Book up to that time in use—the Book which was the subject of the *Hampton Court Conference*—rested upon the Canons of 1603-4; and it is hard to suppose that the most obvious "laws" of all, those in force up to that moment, were excluded from the saving power of this 24th clause. Their Lordships think that the Canons relating to the *Vestments* of the Ministers were not repealed by the *Act of Uniformity*, and that the Canons had the same force after the passing of that Act which they had before. The contemporary exposition on this point is very strong. Bishop *Henckman*, of Salisbury, in 1662, in inquiring whether his Churches are provided with the Prayer Book "newly established," inquires for the "comely, large, and fine Surplice," and for no other Vestment. The same inquiry for the "comely large Surplice, for the Minister to wear at all times of his ministration," is found in a great number of Visitation Articles, republished by the Ritual Commission (2nd Rep., Appendix, pp. 606, 614, and following), extending from 1662 to the end of the century. Bishop *Fuller*, of Lincoln, A.D. 1671; Bishop *Gunning*, of Ely, A.D. 1679, and Bishop *Trimnell*, of Norwich, A.D. 1716, refer to the 58th Canon as unrepealed, in the margin of their Visitation Articles upon the *Sur-*

plice. Their Lordships are of opinion that the Canon was not repealed, and that the Ecclesiastical authorities had no suspicion that it had been.

II. The next opinion is, that the Canons and the *Act of Uniformity*, being irreconcilable, set up distinct standards of Ritual, the one of a more elaborate the other of a severer type, the one a *maximum*, and the other a *minimum*; the one represented by the Rubric and the other by the 58th Canon. To this view the learned Judge in the Court below appears to incline. Their Lordships, notwithstanding this authority, are obliged to come to the conclusion that this view is at variance with all the facts of the case. They have already observed that the *Chasuble*, *Alb*, and *Tunicle* were swept away with severe exactness in the time of Queen *Elizabeth*, and that there was no trace of any attempt to revive them. The *Act of Uniformity* reflects by the strictness of its provisions, the temper of the framers. The fate of a "proviso as to the dispensation with deprivation, for not using the cross and surplice" which was sent down from the House of Lords to the House of Commons, illustrates this. The Commons rejected the proviso (Commons' Journals, viii., 413), and in the subsequent conference between the two Houses, the Manager, Serjeant *Charlton*, gave, amongst other reasons for rejecting the proviso, "that it would unavoidably establish schism . . . that he thought it better to impose no ceremonies than to dispense with any; and he thought it very incongruous at the same time when you are settling uniformity to establish schism." (Lords' Journals, vol. xi. p. 449). And the House of Lords agreed that this proviso should be struck out (Lords' Journals, vol. xi. pp. 450*a*, 450*b*). It cannot be supposed that an Act which applied the principle of uniformity so strictly in one direction, was intended, on the other, to open the door to a return to practices that were suspected as Romish, and this without serious remonstrance in either House from the minority. The purpose of the Act is clear. It was to establish a uniformity upon all parties alike. That is its language, and that is the interpretation it bore with those in authority, who had to expound it in Visitation Articles and the like.

III. The third opinion remains, that the provisions of the Rubric of *Edward VI.* are continued, so far as they are not contrariant to other provisions still in force. And here it is to be observed again that the Rubric was altered, after refusal to listen to the Puritan objections, to a form different from that of any former Rubric, by

introducing the word "retained." Both in the Statute of *Elizabeth* and in the Rubric in question the word "retain" seems to mean that things should remain as they were at the time of the enactment. *Chasuble*, *Alb*, and *Tunicle* had disappeared for more than sixty years; and it has been argued fairly that this word would not have force to bring back anything that had disappeared more than a generation ago. To retain means, in common parlance, to continue something now in existence. It is reasonable to presume that the alteration was not made without some purpose; and it appears to their Lordships, that the words of the Rubric strictly construed would not suffice to revive Ornaments, which had been lawfully set aside, although they were in use in the second year of *Edward VI*. But whether this be so or not, their Lordships are of opinion, that as the Canons of 1603-4, which in one part seemed to revive the Vestments, and in another to order the *Surplice* for all ministrations, ought to be construed together, so the *Act of Uniformity* is to be construed with the two Canons on this subject, which it did not repeal, and that the result is that the *Cope* is to be worn in ministering the Holy Communion on high feast days in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, and the *Surplice* in all other ministrations. Their Lordships attach great weight to the abundant evidence which now exists that from the days of *Elizabeth* to about 1840, the practice is uniformly in accordance with this view; and is irreconcilable with either of the other views. Through the researches that have been referred to in these remarks, a clear and abundant *expositio contemporanea* has been supplied, which compensates for the scantiness of some other materials for a judgment.

It is quite true that neither contrary practice nor disuse can repeal the positive enactment of a Statute, but contemporaneous and continuous usage is of the greatest efficacy in law, for determining the true construction of obscurely framed documents. In the case of the *Attorney-General v. the Mayor of Bristol* (2 Jac. and W., p. 321) Lord Eldon observes: "Length of time (though it must be admitted that the charity is not barred by it), is a very material consideration, when the question is, what is the effect and true construction of the instrument? Is it according to the practice and enjoyment which has obtained for more than two centuries, or has that practice and enjoyment been a breach of trust?" We may ask, in like manner, what is the true construction of the Act of 1662, and of the Rubric which it sanctioned? Is it according to the practice of two centuries, or was the

practice a continual breach of the Law, commanded and enforced by the Bishops, including the very Bishops who aided in framing the Act?

The learned Judge relies on two former judgments of this Committee as having almost determined the question of vestments; one of them in the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*, and the other in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*.

In *Westerton v. Liddell* the question which their Lordships had to decide was, whether the Rubric which excluded all use of crosses in the service, affected crosses not used in the service, but employed for decoration of the building only, and they determined that these were unaffected by the Rubric.

They decided that the Rubric in question referred to the Act passed in 2 and 3 Edw. VI., adopting the First Prayer Book, and not to any Canons or Injunctions having the authority of Parliament, but adopted at an earlier period. Their Lordships feel quite free to adopt both the positive and the negative conclusions thus arrived at. In construing the expressions made use of in that judgment, it should be borne in mind that this question of the *Vestments* was not before the Court.

In *Martin v. Mackonochie* the Committee stated anew the substance of the judgment in *Westerton v. Liddell* upon this point, but did not propose to take up any new ground.

Their Lordships will advise her Majesty, that the Respondent has offended against the Laws Ecclesiastical in wearing the *Chasuble*, *Alb*, and *Tunicle*; and that a Monition shall issue against the Respondent accordingly.—Law Reports, Appellate Series, 1871. Part IV. pp. 634-651.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT
ON THE
EASTWARD POSITION
AT THE
COMMUNION SERVICE.

Extract from the Judgment in HEBBERT *v.* PURCHAS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, Lord Hatherley, in delivering the Judgment of the Privy Council, February 23, 1871, said—

It remains to consider part of the 17th Article of Charge, which sets out that the Respondent, during the whole of the Prayer of Consecration at the Holy Communion, “stood at the middle of that side of the Holy Table, which, if, the said Holy Table stood at the east end of the said Church or Chapel (the said Table in *St. James’s Chapel*, in fact, standing at the west end thereof), would be the west side of such table, in such wise that you then stood between the People and the said Holy Table, with your back to the People, so that the People could not see you break the Bread or take the Cup into your hand.” The learned Judge deals with this charge very briefly, believing it to have been settled by this Committee in the judgment in *Martin v. Mackonochie*. He says, “I must observe that the Rubric does not require that the People should see the breaking of the Bread, or the taking of the Cup into the Priest’s hands; and, if it did so prescribe, the evidence in this case would establish that all the Congregation could see him take the Cup into his hand, and some of them at least could see him break the Bread.” (*Law Rep.* 3 A. and E. 109). The Rubric on this point is this: “When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the People, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth.” Their Lordships are of opinion that

these words mean, that the Priest is so to stand that the people present may see him break the Bread and take the Cup into his hands ; although the learned judge is right, if he means to say that the mere words do not speak of seeing.

Their Lordships think that the evidence of the Witness, *Verrall*, which there is no reason to doubt ; proves that "generally the congregation could not see" the breaking of the Bread, because the Respondent had his back turned to them. As regards the Cup, the Witness said that they could see him take the Cup into his hand, but being asked further, he says, "I could tell he was taking the Cup into his hand." This is consistently explained by supposing that the witness and others could see a certain motion of the Respondent which from their knowledge of the service, and from the subsequent elevation, they were sure was the taking of the Cup into his hands. It would probably be impossible in any position so to act that all the congregation could see, or that all should be unable to see ; but we take it as proved that the greater part of the congregation could not see the breaking of the Bread or the act of taking the Cup into the hands.

The facts being established, their Lordships proceed to consider the question itself. In default of argument on the Respondent's side, they have been somewhat aided by a large mass of controversial literature, which shews how much interest this question excites, and which has probably left few of the facts unnoticed.

The Rubric upon the position of the Table, directs that it shall "stand in the body of the Church or in the Chancel, where morning and evening prayer are appointed to be said." This is the same as the Rubrics of 1552, 1559, and 1604, excepting the verbal alteration of *are* for *be*. It goes on, "And the Priest standing at the north side of the Table, shall say the Lord's Prayer with the Collect following." The Table is a moveable Table. By the injunctions of Queen *Elizabeth* (*Cardwell*, Doc. Ann. Vol. I., p. 201) it is ordered, "that the Holy Table in every Church be decently made, and set in the place, where the Altar stood, and there commonly covered, as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the Visitors, and so to stand,

saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the Chancel, as whereby the Minister may be more conveniently heard of the Communicants in his prayer and ministrations, and the Communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the said Minister. And after the Communion is done, from time to time the same holy table to be placed where it stood before." If this custom still prevailed of bringing the Table from the east and placing it in the Chancel, the two Rubrics would present no difficulty. The Priest standing on the north side, as directed by the one, would also be standing before the Table so as to break the Bread before the People, and take the Cup into his hand as required by the other. No direction was given for a change of position in the Prayer of Consecration in the second Book of King *Edward VI.*, but only a change of posture in the words, "standing up." But before the time of the Revision of 1662, the custom of placing the Table along the east wall was becoming general, and it may fairly be said that the Revisers must have had this in view.

The following questions appear to require an answer, in order to dispose of this part of the case: what is meant by the "north side of the table?" What change, if any, is ordered by the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration? And what is the meaning of "before the People" in that Rubric?

As to the first question, their Lordships are of opinion that "north side of the table" means that side which looks towards the north.

They have considered some ingenious arguments intended to prove that "north side" means that part of the west side that is nearest to the north. One of these is that the middle of the Altar before the Reformation, was occupied by a stone or slab, called *mensa consecratoria* and *sigillum altaris*, that the part of the Altar north of this was called north side, and that to the south of it was called the south side. Without enquiring whether English altars were generally so constructed, which is to say, the least, doubtful, their Lordships observe that in the directions for the substitution of a moveable Table for the Altar, and for its decent covering, and its position at

various times, there is no hint that this is to revive the peculiarity of the Altar which it replaced; and they do not believe that the Table was so arranged or divided.

Another argument is drawn from the Jewish Ritual. On offering sacrifices before the Lord, the Altar was to be sprinkled with the blood, and a red line was drawn across the altar to mark the height at which it should be sprinkled; and it is argued that the line being only in front, the Priest must have stood in front in order to see it and be guided by it. But on the other hand the line probably went all round the altar, and the sprinkling was applied to all the sides. And even if the fact was rightly stated, it would be impossible to allow an argument so remote and shadowy to supersede the plain sense of a direction so clear in itself. When the Table was placed in the body of the Church or the Chancel, the Priest or Minister was to stand on the north side of it, looking south.

When it became the custom to place the Table altarwise against the east wall, the Rubric remained the same. And there are many authorities to shew, that the position of the Minister was still upon the north side or end, facing south. It is only necessary to cite a few. Archdeacon *Pory* (1662), in his Visitation Articles, says: "The Minister standing, as he is appointed, at the north side or end of the Table when he celebrates the Holy Communion." In the dispute between the Vicar of *Grantham* and his parishioners (1627), Bishop *Williams* plainly shews that whichever way the Table was to stand, which was the matter in dispute, the position of the Minister was on the north. "If you mean by altarwise that the table shall stand along close by the wall, so that you be forced to officiate at one end thereof (as you may have observed in great men's Chapels), I do not believe that ever the Communion Tables were otherwise than by casualty so placed in country Churches." He also says: "I conceive the alteration was made in the Rubric to shew which way the Celebrant was to face." *Heylin*, Coale from the Altar, and *Williams*, Holy Table. *Heylin* says, quoting the Latin Prayer Book of 1560: "I presume that no man of reason can deny but that the northern end or side, call it which you will, is *pars septentrionalis*,

the northern part." ("Coale from the Altar.") When Bishop *Wren* was impeached in the House of Lords, A.D. 1636, for consecrating the Elements on the west side of the Table, he answered that he stood on the north side at all the rest of the service except at the Prayer of Consecration. "He humbly conceiveth it is a plain demonstration that he came to the west side only for the more convenience of executing his office, and no way at all in any superstition, much less in any imitation of the Romish priests, for they place themselves there at all the service before, and at all after, with no less strictness than at the time of consecrating the bread and wine." *Nicholls*, Commentary on Common Prayer, (published 1710), *Bennett*, Annotations on Book of Common Prayer, (1708), *Wheatley* Rational Illustrations of Common Prayer, (1710), confirm the view that when the table was placed east and west, the Minister's position was still on the north.

Their Lordships entertain no doubt whatever that when the Table was set at the east end the direction to stand at the north side was understood to apply to the north end, and that this was the practice of the Church.

It will be convenient to consider next what is the meaning of the words "before the People," in the Rubric before the Consecration Prayer. *Nicholls* (*Op. cit.*) observes: "To say the Consecration Prayer (in the recital of which the Bread is broken) standing before the Table, is not to break the Bread before the People; for then the People cannot have a view thereof, which our wise Reformers, upon very good reasoning, ordered that they should." That stress was laid on this witness of the people of the act of breaking, appears by other passages; for example, *Udall* says: "We press the action of breaking the Bread against the Papist. To what end, if not that the beholders might thereby be led unto the breaking of the Body of Christ?" "Communion Comeliness," (1641). *Wheatley* (*Op. cit.*) says: "Whilst the Priest is ordering the Bread and Wine he is to stand before the Table; but when he says the Prayer, he is to stand so that he may with more readiness and decency break the Bread before the People, which must be on the north side. For if he stood before the

table, his body would hinder the People from seeing, so that he must not stand there, and consequently he must stand on the north side, there being, in our present Rubric, no other place for the performance of any part of this office."

Their Lordships consider that the Respondent, in standing with his back to the people, disobeyed the Rubric, in preventing the People from seeing the breaking of the bread.

The north side being the proper place for the Minister throughout the Communion office, and also whilst he is saying the Prayer of Consecration, the question remains, whether the words "standing before the table" direct any temporary change of position in the Minister before saying the Prayer of Consecration? This is not the most important, but it is the most difficult question. One opinion is that of *Wheatley*, who interprets the Rubric as sending the Priest to the west side of the Table to order the Elements, and recalling him for the Prayer itself. This, however, would be needless if the Elements were so placed on the Table, as that the Priest could, "with readiness and decency," order them from the north side, as is often done.

It would also be needless in any case, where the Communion Table was placed in the body of the Church, or in the Chancel with its ends east and west. And though this position is not likely now to be adopted, the question is, whether that was the law at the time this Rubric was drawn. Now, the Rubric prescribes that the table shall stand "in the body of the Church or in the Chancel where Morning and Evening Prayers are appointed to be said;" and there are two cases, which occurred in 1633, those of *Crayford* (*Cardwell*, Doc. Ann. Vol. ii. 226), and *St. Gregory's, London* (*Ibid.* ii. 237), which show that the Table, though placed at the east end, might be moved for convenience' sake and under competent authority. This, too, is the view of Bishop *Wren* in 1636 (*Ibid.* ii. 252), "That the Communion Table in every Church do always stand close under the east wall of the Chancel, the ends thereof north and south, unless the Ordinary give particular directions otherwise." Should the Table be placed with its ends east and west, it would be absurd to enforce a rule that the Priest should go

to the west end to order the Elements, seeing the north side would be in every way more convenient.

Upon these facts their Lordships incline to think, that the Rubric was purposely framed so as not to direct or insist on a change of position in the Minister, which might be needless; though it does direct a change of posture from kneeling to standing. The words are intended to set the Minister free for the moment, from the general direction to stand at the north side, for the special purpose of ordering the Elements; but whether for this purpose he would have to change the side or not is not determined, as it would depend on the position of the Table in the Church or Chancel, and on the position in which the Elements were placed on the Table at first. They think that the main object of this part of the Rubric is the ordering of the Elements; and that the words "before the Table" do not necessarily mean "between the Table and the People," and are not intended to limit to any side.

The learned Judge in the Court below, in considering the charge against the Respondent, that he stood with his back to the people during the Prayer of Consecration, briefly observes "the question appears to me to have been settled by the Privy Council in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*." (*Law Reports*, 3 A. and E. 109). The question before their Lordships in that case was as to the posture and not as to the position of the Minister. The words of the judgment are: "Their Lordships entertain no doubt on the construction of this Rubric" [before the Prayer of Consecration] "that the Priest is intended to continue in one posture during the prayer, and not to change from standing to kneeling, or *vice versa*; and it appears to them equally certain that the Priest is intended to stand and not to kneel. They think that the words 'standing before the Table' apply to the whole sentence; and they think this is made more apparent by the consideration, that acts are to be done by the Priest before the people, as the prayer proceeds (such as taking the Paten and Chalice into his hands, breaking the Bread, and laying his hand on the various Vessels) which could only be done in the attitude of standing."—(*Law Reports*, 2 P.C. 382)

This passage refers to posture or attitude from beginning to end, and not to position with reference to the sides of the Table. And it could not be construed to justify Mr. *Purchas* in standing with his back to the people, unless a material addition were made to it. The learned Judge reads it as if it ran, "They think that the words 'standing before the Table' apply to the whole sentence, and that before the Table means between the Table and the People on the west side." But these last words are mere assumption. The question of position was not before their Lordships; if it had been, no doubt the passage would have been conceived differently, and the question of position expressly settled.

Upon the whole then, their Lordships think that the words of Archdeacon, afterwards Bishop, *Cosin* in A.D. 1687 express the state of the Law, "Doth he [the Minister] stand at the north side of the Table, and perform all things there, but when he hath special cause to remove from it, as in reading and preaching upon the Gospel, or in delivering the Sacrament to the communicants, or other occasions of the like nature." (Bishop *Cosin's* Correspondence, Part I, p. 106, *Surtees Soc. Pub.*) They think that the Prayer of Consecration is to be used at the north side of the Table, so that the Minister looks south, whether a broader or a narrower side of the Table be towards the north.

It is mentioned that Mr. *Purchas's* Chapel does not stand in the usual position, and that, in fact, he occupied the east side when he stood with his back towards the People. If it had happened, as it does in one of the Chapels Royal, that the north side had been where the west side usually is, a question between the letter and the spirit of the Rubrics would have arisen. But the Respondent seems to us to have departed both from the letter and the spirit of the Rubrics; and our advice to Her Majesty will be, that a Monition should issue to him as to this charge also.—*Law Reports, Appellate Series*, 1871, *Part IV. Vol. iii. pp.* 657-664.

PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT

ON

WAFER-BREAD.

Extract from the Judgment in HEBBERT *v.* PURCHAS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, Lord Hatherley, in delivering Judgment, Feb. 23, 1871, said—

The Twentieth Article charges the Respondent with using on divers occasions "Wafer-Bread, being Bread made in the special shape and fashion of circular wafers, instead of Bread such as is usual to be eaten," and with administering the same to the Communicants. The Rubric of the Prayer Book now in force runs thus:—"And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and Wine, it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten." This is the same with the Rubrics of 1552, 1559, and 1604, with two exceptions. The present Rubric omits after "eaten" the words "at the Table with other meats," and it introduces words which have been prominent in the argument in this case. Instead of "to take away the superstition," it reads "to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition." In the first Book of *Edward VI.* the direction is different:—"For avoiding all matter and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the Bread prepared for the Communion be made, through all this realm, after one sort or fashion; that is to say, unleavened, and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and

2

something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces; and every one shall be divided in two pieces, at the least, or more, by the discretion of the Minister, and so distributed." One of the *Elizabethan* Injunctions (of 1559), is at variance with the *Elizabethan* Rubric, continued from the Second Book of King *Edward*, and provides as follows:—"Where, also, it was, in the time of King *Edward* VI., used to have the Sacramental Bread of common fine Bread, it is ordered for the more reverence to be given to these holy mysteries, being the Sacraments of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that this same Sacramental Bread be made and formed plain, without any figure thereupon, of the same fineness and fashion round, though somewhat bigger in compass and thickness, as the usual Bread and Wafer heretofore named singing-cakes, which served for the use of the private Mass:" *Cardwell*, Doc. Ann. Vol. 1, p. 202, [Ed. 1839]. The learned Judge calls this Injunction a "*contemporanea expositio*" of the Rubric, but it is in fact a superseding of the Rubric, nor can it be regarded as at all reconcilable with it. Upon these facts the learned Judge decides as follows:—"It appears, therefore, that while the first Rubric prescribed a uniformity of size and material, the later and the present Rubric are contented with the order that the purest wheaten Flour shall suffice, and the Bread may be leavened according to the use of the Eastern, or unleavened according to the use of the Western Church."—*Law Rep.* 3. A. & E. 103.

Their Lordships do not find any mention of Flour, and, apart from this slight inadvertence, their Lordships are unable to accept this view of the passages that have been quoted. The First Book of *Edward* has in view uniformity of practice, and not the choice of two practices: the bread is to be made "through all this realm after the same sort and fashion." The Second Book of *Edward* VI. is not so positive in form, for the words "it shall suffice" are used; but it produced uniformity, and not diversity, for the Injunction of 1559 says: "It was in the time of King *Edward* VI., used to have the Sacra-

mental Bread of common fine Bread." This general use the Injunction proposes to change ; but, again, the Order is universal, and binds the very minutest details: the Bread is to be plain without any figure, fashioned round, but somewhat bigger in compass and thickness than the Cakes used in private Masses. There is no trace of an intention to leave men free to follow the fashion of the Eastern, or of the Western Church. So there are three distinct Orders: first, for Wafer-Bread, unleavened as before, but larger and without print ; then for common Bread usual at the Table ; then for a new kind of Bread thicker than the Wafer, and without symbolical figures : and the first and last are in their form universal and absolute ; and the second also had brought about a general usage, and not a diversity. There was, no doubt, a great division of opinion upon this question, and this makes it all the more remarkable, that none of the three Orders takes the natural course of leaving the matter free. Each seems to have aimed at uniformity, but each in a different practice.

But it has been argued by some that the phrase "it shall suffice", implies a permission ; that the words may mean "it shall be sufficient, but another usage is allowed, and might even be better." On the other hand, it has been argued, that in other places in the Liturgy, "it shall suffice" must be construed into a positive direction ; that if "it shall suffice" to pour Water on a sickly child, this ought to restrain the Clergyman from immersing a child known to be sickly ; that even the weaker form "it may suffice" in the Rubric, as to Children and infants brought to be baptised, conveys to the Minister a distinct direction as to what he is to do, and leaves no alternative course apparent ; that "it shall suffice that the Litany be once read" for both Deacons and Priests is meant to be, and is received as, a positive order ; and that in such cases "it shall suffice" means "it shall be sufficient for the completeness of a sacrament or for the observance by the Minister of the Rubric." Their Lordships are disposed to construe this phrase in each case according to the context. Here the expression is "to take away all occasion of dissension and

superstition it shall suffice." If these words left the whole matter open, and only provided that the usual Bread should be sufficient where it happened to be used, it is difficult to see how either dissension or superstition would be taken away: not dissension, for there would be a licence that had not existed since the Reformation; nor superstition, for the old Wafer with its "print," its "figures," which the First Book of *Edward* and the Injunctions desired might be excluded, might now be used, if this Rubric were the only restraint. Their Lordships are therefore inclined to think, on this ground alone that the Rubric contains a positive direction to employ at the Holy Communion the usual bread.

It is at least worthy of notice that when *Cosin* and others, at the last revision, desired to insert the words making the Wafer also lawful, these words were rejected.

But their Lordships attach greater weight to the exposition of this Rubric furnished by the history of the question. From a large collection of Visitation Articles, from the time of *Charles II.*, it is clear that the best and purest wheat Bread was to be provided for the Holy Communion, and no other kind of Bread. They believe that from that time till about 1840 the practice of using the usual wheat-Bread was universal.

The words of the 20th Canon, to which the Visitation Articles refer, point the same way. The Churchwardens are bound to supply "wheaten bread," and this alone is mentioned. If Wafer-bread is equally permitted, or the special cakes of *Edward VI.*'s First Book, and of the Injunctions, it is hard to see why the Parish is to supply wheaten Bread, in cases where Wafers are to be supplied by the Minister, or from some other source. And if Wafers were to be in use, a general Injunction to all Churchwardens to supply wheaten Bread would be quite inapplicable to all Churches where there should be another usage.

Upon the whole, their Lordships think that the law of the Church has directed the use of pure wheat-Bread, and they must so advise her Majesty.—*Law Reports, Appellate Series*, 1871. Part IV. Vol. iii. p. 653-656.

THE EASTWARD POSITION.

BY THE REV. C. DALLAS MARSTON, M.A.,

Vicar of St. Paul's, Onslow Square, London.

THE questions which for a long time have agitated our Church, so far from assuming an air of settlement, are being considered and discussed more and more intently. Much as this is, in one sense, to be deplored, there is this advantage—that the dividing lines between the differing sides are more distinct, and it becomes increasingly easy to understand our relative positions.

These questions may now be said to be grouped under two heads, and the contention is likely to be carried on, at any rate for some time, around these two points, the points before us to-day, viz., the Eastward Position and the distinctive Eucharistic dress. All that is in debate is so connected with these that the consideration of them will really involve all besides. The real character of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be called the pivot on which the ministerial functions hinge. If this Sacrament is what some say that it is, then the Eastward Position and the distinctive Eucharistic dress may well be contended for: if this Sacrament is not of the peculiar character which some would assign to it, then there can be no need either for the position or the vestment.

It is true that there are those who favour the two points under review who yet disclaim any intention of attaching undue importance to them. These points have been ushered officially, as one may say, into prominence by the two Houses of Convocation; and the members of Convocation who have thus undertaken the sponsorship for these matters have done their best to plead their cause by professing signal moderation. Thus, in the Upper House of Convocation on the 7th July last, the Bishop of Lincoln having proposed a resolution, which was seconded by the Bishop of Salisbury, not simply authorising, but requiring, the use of albes, copes and tunics, and—in the case of a Bishop, the pastoral staff—at the administration of the Holy Communion, and having, upon remonstrance, withdrawn his motion on the 10th July, the Bishop of Lichfield submitted a very much modified proposal,

seconded by the Bishop of Peterborough, in which he contented himself with stating that "a large number of the clergy and faithful laity of the Church are of opinion that the use of a distinctive dress in ministering the Holy Communion would tend to reverence and edification," and with suggesting that such dress should be permitted only at such places and on such conditions as should be approved by authority. To this the Bishop of Salisbury, who had seconded the original motion, cordially agreed; and the Bishop of Lincoln, who had made the original motion, now proposed a rider to the effect that it should be distinctly understood that nothing is symbolised by such vestments at variance with the doctrine of the Church of England. It will be observed that the bold proposal of the Bishop of Lincoln assumed at last a very apologetic air in the hands of those who favoured it.

Similar remarks may be made as regards the Eastward Position, and many of those persons who are inclined either to advocate or to tolerate it. For instance, a proposal was made by the Bishop of Peterborough which would have included the adoption of this position among the things which should be exempt from proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act, on the ground that it is not desirable that the clergy and laity should be disquieted by litigation on any such matters. Again, at the commencement of the debates in the Lower House of Convocation on Rubrics as connected with the possible action of the Public Worship Regulation Bill, the Prolocutor of the Lower House said that it might be possible, without altering the Rubrics themselves, to suggest that while in the judgment of many the Rubric does direct the position of the priest in the act of consecration to be in front of the Holy Table, the House did not wish to fetter those clergymen who had been accustomed to use another position; and, further, that he thought that a declaration leaving the position open would tend to the peace and stability of the Church, and to the comfort of many officiating clergymen. Dr. Jebb stated that he did not want any compromise, but such a relaxation as the laws of charity require. The Rev. C. R. Knight said: "These men (the Ritualists) have been recognised as the most earnest, the most laborious, and the most self-denying of the clergy of this country, and we may well say of them, '*Ubi plura nitent, non ego paucis offendar maculis.*' Surely the Church of England is wide enough and strong enough to bear a few eccentricities on one side or the other without being frightened out of her propriety."

Add to these more formal expressions as to the question being an open one, those which are very commonly heard—for example; The position, we are told, has been adopted by many clergymen without any symbolising idea, or because, as they believe, the judgment in the Mackonochie case required it; many congregations have been accustomed to see the clergyman stand thus and think nothing of it; the position in itself is indifferent and innocent; and so forth.

The instances thus given will serve to shew that not a few—and of these some who may be said to speak with authority—deal with the question of the Eastward Position as one which may be left to individual decision, and cannot, therefore, be regarded as so weighty as to bind all to the essential principle; or as one which may be safely compromised to a greater or less extent; or even as one involving a mere eccentricity which the Church may be thought wise enough to suffer.

Careful, however, as these pleadings are, or kindly intentioned and charitable as they seem to be, we can hardly accept them as satisfactory. For other utterances than these have to be considered, utterances which force themselves upon consideration with the air of authority. To keep to the point upon which I am specially engaged, that of the Eastward Position. Dr. Pusey has written (*Times*, July 24) that the Eastward Position of the celebrant symbolises "what we know to be primitive truth, and to have been taught as such by a long catena of English divines." He has also stated at a meeting in St. James's Hall, June 16, 1874:—"What so simple as that the celebrant should, as praying with and for the people, stand before the altar? Yet they (the Puritan opponents of ritual) saw that although the Eucharistic Sacrifice could be believed and offered, whatever the position of the celebrant, this position meant the Eucharistic Sacrifice . . . that this position involved . . . the whole, as we know it to be, primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. . . . The standing before the altar means the primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice." Mr. Carter at the same meeting said that he should never forget the impression produced on his mind when he first saw a celebration in front of the altar; that there was then opened to him a new world of thought as to the Blessed Eucharist, that he then first realised it as an act done by a priest towards God, not a mere praying in the presence of a congregation, but an oblation to the living God by a person representing the congregation. He further stated that this Eastward Position is one of the five points which he and those who feel with him cannot think of surrendering, because they contend for them as the rightful heritage of the Church of England, and because they claim these outward expressions in the same way that they claim their doctrine. The Rev. N. Pocock, speaking at the same meeting, declared that it is as absurd to ask men to conform to a decision against the Eastward Position as to ask them to believe that black is white, or that two and two make five.

I need not multiply quotations. We must all feel that the Eastward Position cannot be regarded as a matter of such small importance that it may be conceded or not. It is a keystone of the system, it is a cardinal article of ritual; in contending against it we contend against that in which the weightiest matters are involved. The references already given to what has been written and said by the advocates of the position are sufficiently significant; and we may well express our astonishment, if nothing more, that, while such sentiments are avowed by leaders and applauded to the echo by followers, it should be possible for us to witness in one of the Houses of Convocation an attempt to legalise a practice which confessedly, and even boastfully, covers doctrine and opinion which we can only feel to be promotive of error of the most grievous kind.

For, as to the Eastward Position, its essence lies in this, that the clergyman should so place himself as to impress the congregation with the belief that he is *not* one ministering to them, *but* one ministering *for* them; so that the idea of a supper should be done away, and the idea of a rite mysterious and ecclesiastical be substituted in its room.

The following extracts from a Catechism upon Ritual—"The Ritual Reason Why"—show this plainly:—

301 . . . Explain in general why in the greater part of the celebration of the Holy Communion he (the priest) keeps his back to the people? *Ans.* This was also the position of the Jewish Priest, who ministered, "before the Lord," at the Altar of Incense, and at the table of shew-bread, *i.e.* facing the hidden mercy-

seat beyond. As to the position being observed in this place, it is sufficient to say that the priest being engaged in an act of Ministry before the Lord, although in the presence and on behalf of the people, he only turns from the altar for some weighty cause and in direct addresses to the flock.

345. Why is the priest to say it (the Prayer of Consecration) "standing before the" Altar? *Ans.* Because this is the position of a Sacrificing Priest.

340. What is the prayer which the priest says kneeling at the midst of the Altar? *Ans.* It is a humble acknowledgment of his own unworthiness to execute the ministry which he is about to perform, and of that of the communicants to join with him in the Sacrifice by feasting on the Sacred Victim who is now about to be offered.—"*Ritual Reason Why*," p. 136.

Teaching like this can only be met by a bold and unflinching exposure of its utter opposition to the doctrine of the Church of England, and of its utter falsehood when tried by the standard of the New Testament Scriptures. In the first place this idea of the Lord's Supper as a rite mysterious and ecclesiastical, a rite in which vestments, posture, and various adjuncts, are essential, a rite which involves a sacrificing priest engaged on behalf of the Church—this idea is not the idea of the New Testament. There all that is recorded concerning the Lord's Supper in the Gospels and other notices, is simple and plain, free from mystery and cloudy guise, free from priestly sacrifice and oblation. Canon Selwyn has well said, "I cannot but feel that the position which hides from the communicants the breaking of the bread, the blessing of the cup, and the minister's own partaking, and makes the words of the office less audible, is a departure from the example of our Lord."

Nor is it only to the New Testament that a reference must be made. The mind of the Church of England must be taken into account; and now that I approach this point, I would preface a brief inquiry into the language of our Prayer Book, by quoting some passages from the writings of men of eminence, which have become familiar, but which it may be well for us to hear again. Take the words of Canon Selwyn, in which he continues the paragraph already noticed. This position, he says, "makes a mystery where the Church ordains a public witness and shewing forth of the Lord's death before the people, and casts doubts on the belief of the Church of England expressed in her reformed office." The late Professor Blunt writes thus in his treatise on the "duties of a parish priest"—the passage is annexed to Professor Selwyn's correspondence with the three Deans.

We now come to the Rubric before Consecration of the Elements (A.D. 1661).

This Rubric, again, has ministered cause of debate. "The Priest standing before the table," you will take notice is a different phrase from "standing at the north side of the table," and implies a different thing; viz., that he shall stand in front of the table, with his back to the people, till he has "ordered" the elements, and prepared them for the rite, interposing his person between the congregation and the table, till whatever is merely *mechanical* in the act shall have been completed, the Church not wishing to make that meaner part of the Service a spectacle. This done, he returns to the north side, and breaks the bread, and takes the cup, "before the people," i.e., *in their sight*,—the Church not wishing to make the manner of Consecration as the Romish priest does, a mystery. Thus the former position was merely taken up in order to the subsequent act, that the Priest "*may*, with the more readiness and decency, break the bread." So that they mistake this Rubric altogether, I apprehend, and violate both its letter and spirit, who *consecrate* the elements with their backs to the people, after the manner of the Church or

Rome. All that they have to do in that position is, to *order* the elements, so that they *may* afterwards break the bread and take the cup with more decency."

Before I leave this reference to Professor Selwyn, let me recommend all who have not seen his published correspondence with the Deans of St. Paul's, York, and Manchester, to possess themselves of it, and study it carefully. His letter to the Dean of York on page 18, and that to the Dean of Manchester, on page 21, are admirable.

Let me add to this a quotation from a speech of Canon Swainson's in Convocation, during the debate on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, on the 7th July last:—"We have all, I suppose, seen a copy of the Prayer Book attached to the Act of Uniformity. We have seen what the last alterations introduced into that Act were. We have seen that at the very last moment an alteration which had been proposed, and, no doubt, had gone through Convocation, allowing the clergyman to stand at the north *part* of the table; was altered so that he should stand at the north *side*. The question arises, What is the meaning of that? Does it mean that the Bishops or Convocation intended that the clergyman should stand, as many of my friends do, at the northern extremity of the west side? The fact is that the north part was altered at the last moment, so that the Rubric was restored to the condition in which it was in the reign of James I." Again, Canon Swainson further said, with respect to the position of the minister at the beginning of the Communion Service, "I should very much like that the attention of the Committee should be drawn to a most interesting point in the Life and Memoirs of Bishop Andrewes, in which we have a picture of his chapel as it was laid out. The drawings . . . are to be seen in the British Museum. In those drawings you have distinctly the cushions upon which the clergy were to kneel at the north end of the table and at the south end of the table. Whatever his view might be with regard to the time of celebration, or the position of the celebrant, his interpretation of the Rubric as it existed at that time with respect to the position of the clergy at the beginning of the Communion Service was that which has been the ordinary interpretation of the Church of England from that time to this. Bishop Andrewes spoke of the clergy in their surplices at these two ends of the table as being symbolical of the cherubim over the mercy-seat."

The arguments to be drawn from quotations like these may safely take the ground that there is no warrant for this Eastward Position in the Prayer Book of the Church of England, except when the ordering of the bread and wine requires the officiating minister to stand before the table. And if we look into the Prayer Book itself, there is everything, so far as plain direction and sound deduction are concerned, to strengthen the argument. For, whereas in the first Book of Edward VI. the direction was as follows:—"The priest standing humbly afore the middes of the altar . . ." in the second Prayer Book this direction was changed to the following: ". . . the priest standing at the north side of the table;" and this last direction continued through the successive books, and is found in our Book of Common Prayer. One may therefore well say that he is unable to believe that it could have been the intention of the framers and reviewers of the Liturgy, by the rubrical change above noticed, simply to remove the officiating minister a very short distance to the left of his former position. On the contrary, it must be assumed that it was intended definitely to alter his position from "afore the middes of the altar," where his back would be to the people, to the "north side of the table." This position is further explained by the Rubric of

1661, which provides that the priest may "with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people."

This view of the case is moreover confirmed by the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in *Hebbert v. Purchas*, by which the right position of the officiating minister during the prayer of consecration was decided to be at the north side of the table, so that he shall look south, and which stated that the words of the Rubric, which directs that the priest shall stand before the table while ordering the bread and wine, could not be construed to justify the minister in standing with his back to the people, as this would frustrate the very object of the other portion of the same Rubric which requires the priest to break the bread before the people.

But besides this, I suppose that we may safely assert that, if a Rubric is simply a direction by which the outward act is to be regulated, and the outward act is to be expressive of the sentiment and opinion maintained in any particular matter, then if the mind of our Church can be distinctly gathered upon the subject of the Lord's Supper, the rubrical direction must be interpreted in accordance with the sentiment which is held; and this is all the more evident when it is undeniable that a very important change has been made and preserved in the words of the Rubric itself. Now we have seen that the essence of the Eastward Position consists in its connection with the idea of a sacrifice, and in the face of this I would ask this Conference to examine the language of the Prayer Book in the Catechism, in the service for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, and in the Articles, and to say whether there is any trace of the doctrine of a sacrifice, as the word is strictly understood, in any one of these portions of the Book.

In the sentences of the Catechism which define and illustrate the meaning of the word "Sacrament" and its application to the Lord's Supper, we are taught that what is outward and visible is a *sign*; that it is a *sign of grace*, not the sign of a substance present though hidden from view; that, in the Lord's Supper, the sign continues to be bread and wine; that the thing signified, not the thing present though hidden, is the Body and Blood of Christ.

In the Catechism, therefore, taken in the plainness of its language, there is no trace of the idea of a sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. An outward visible sign, which continues to be such, is exhibited; and the grace which attends the use of that sign is the grace which nourishes, strengthens and refreshes the soul, by virtue of a spiritual feeding on Christ Jesus through the exercise of faith. No young person prepared for confirmation, and thus prepared for admission to the Lord's Supper, if the preparation is carried on in the spirit of the Church Catechism, is led to look for a sacrifice in the questions and answers of that Catechism.

As regards the service for the administration of the Lord's Supper, I need not repeat what is so familiar to everyone as to the avoidance of the word "altar" and the use of the word "table," but I would point out what perhaps has not been made the subject of careful study by us all, the mode in which participation in the ceremony is described. The words employed habitually are "receive" and "take." The communicants do not assist at an offering, do not adore a hidden presence: they receive or take a Sacrament, which has already been defined in the Catechism as an outward sign of an inward grace. It is simply impossible, on any fair interpretation of language, to suppose that the words "receive" and "take" can convey, or be intended to convey, the least idea of a sacrifice.

I would ask you to look yet a little further into the words in which the Church

of England speaks concerning the Lord's Supper. The Catechism having told us that the object of the ordinance is "the continual remembrance of Christ's death," we can trace the idea of remembrance through the Order for administration. A moment's reflection will bring to mind that the standard phrases throughout the service are those which include the word "remember" or "remembrance." From the notice of administration to the actual delivery of the elements, these are the prominent words.

Now, it is of great importance that we should carefully notice this most consistent repetition of the words "remember," "remembrance," "memory." They point in the very opposite direction to that of the idea of a present sacrifice. They from their very nature, carry you back to the past. If there is a sacrifice, the word which enjoins memory is unsuitable; the act which you are desired to perform stultifies the service in which you take a part. But by the Church of England you are told to remember a sacrifice which has long ago been completed; you are not invited to share in a sacrifice which is going on at the time. Your service is one of grateful memory; not one in which you celebrate a propitiation at present taking place.

An examination of the 25th, 28th, and 29th Articles of Religion would lead us—as you well know—to the very same conclusion. The dogmatic teaching of the Church of England will be found to tally with the language which she employs in her formularies, and equally with that language to forbid a belief in a sacrifice properly so called. So that the cursory remarks and references just offered to you may be thus summed up: In the Catechism, that form of Christian instruction by which our younger members are prepared for a further insight into the truths of Christianity; in the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, in which, if anywhere, we might expect the warmest expressions of the intention and nature of the holy rite; in the Articles, where strict definition and explicit teaching must find their place;—in all these we vainly look for the doctrine of a sacrifice; in all these we are constantly met by language which forbids the reception of such a doctrine. I think we may be bold to say that, had the compilers of these several forms themselves held the doctrine of a present sacrifice in the Eucharist, they have most carefully concealed their opinions by their words; that if they intended to teach the doctrine, they have employed language as ill adapted as possible to convey their instruction to those by whom the formularies are used.

A review of the various Prayer Books would only strengthen the position to which I have endeavoured to lead you; but the present occasion is not one on which such a review can be attempted. In connection, however, with the history of the Prayer Book and of the course of sentiment involved in it, I must venture to ask your attention to a very important point bearing upon the revision of the Prayer Book in the Convocation of 1662, during the reign of Charles II. This review resulted in such a modification of the book as was thought desirable previously to its being ratified by the Act of Uniformity.

The Rev. William Sancroft, who was afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, was, at the time of the review, chaplain to Cosin, Bishop of Durham, and was appointed by the Convocation to the responsible work of seeing the revised Prayer Book through the press. "The copy (which was submitted to Convocation for approval and acceptance) was, it may fairly be presumed, drawn up by Mr. Sancroft himself, under the direction of Bishops Cosin and Wren (of Ely), and was produced in the Convocation of the 21st November, 1661, when the committee, of

which these Bishops were the leading members, seem to have reported that the preparations were already made, and that the whole House might proceed immediately to the work of revision. However this may be, the corrections contain . . . strong indications of such sentiments respecting the Real Presence in the Eucharist . . . as were entertained by the Bishops above mentioned. . . . Doubtless the Liturgy provided for Scotland [by Archbishop Laud, and this same Bishop Wren, in 1637], was before them when they made their corrections in the English service. It is clear that they were indebted to it in several of their alterations."—(*Cardwell, Hist. Confer.* p. 389.)

Now, in that Scotch Prayer Book of Laud's this sentence stands in the Rubric before the Prayer for the Church Militant :—"The Presbyter shall then offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's table." And in the book submitted to the Convocation of 1661-2 (which, as we have seen, was prepared by Sancroft), it was proposed that the Rubric should run thus :—"The priest shall then offer up and place upon the table, &c." So averse, however, was the mind of the Church of England from any expression which could be construed as involving the idea of a sacrificial offering of any kind, that the words "offer up" were rejected, and the Rubric made to stand : "When there is a Communion, the priest shall then place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient." Word for word, of course, as it now stands in our Book of Common Prayer.

It is worthy of farther notice that it was at this revision of the Prayer Book that the words "and oblations" were added in the prayer for the Church Militant after "accept our alms;" so that, had Sancroft's suggestion been admitted, an interpretation might have been given to the word "oblations" which would have been foreign to the universal idea of the Church of England on the subject of the Lord's Supper.

I have been thus particular in investigating the subject of sacrifice because it is this which really lies at the root of the matter. The Eastward Position indicates sacrifice, its leading advocates contend for this. If the Church of England does not know of a sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, if she protests against it, if she teaches her children, instructs her members, encourages her communicants, in terms which forbid the idea, what have we to do with the Eastward Position, save when for a few moments it may be required in the ordering of the bread and wine?

This position must not be made obligatory; for then the Communion will cease to be a Sacrament and be acknowledged as a sacrifice.

This position must not be made optional; for then the Communion will be, in the opinion of the Church of England, neither one thing nor the other; it will be anything or nothing.

If this position be legalised, the truth will be either actually or virtually relinquished; Scriptural doctrine will be falsified; venerable traditions and a noble history will be reversed and disgraced to a most serious extent. It is for us by prayerful resolution, by influence, and by the inculcation of sound instruction wherever we can bestow it, to assist under God in maintaining the truth, in upholding the doctrine, and in preserving intact and unsullied the traditions and history of the Reformed Church of England.

VESTMENTS.

BY

LEONARD ROWE VALPY, ESQ.

God in His Providence has, I firmly believe, so overruled events—I speak with all reverence and humility, yet with a clear definite conviction—that the extreme development of the principles against which we contend has led to a sudden awakening of the public mind, reaching, as we may hope, those in authority, both in Church and State, so that now, instead of the rush of the enemy by open assault, we are met by the desire to find some *neutral* ground. Let me trace this position in a few words: it will I think tend in a great measure to develop the principles by which our conduct should be governed.

It was in 1833 that the Tracts for the Times were commenced. The Sacramental system was taught, involving doctrines, which, in the language of Dr. Newman, embraces in its fulness not only what the Anglicans but Catholics believe about Sacraments.

Things progressed so rapidly that, in 1866, Dr. Pusey, when taking a retrospective glance, felt justified in saying, “our office was rather to plant the bulb where it might take root, and grow, and flower, beautifully, fragrantly, lastingly. What we taught in word is now taught in deed.” Doctrine is the bulb; Ritual is the blossom. May I not add—Romanism is the fruit.

Confining myself now to the reintroduction of vestments as a part of this movement, I need but make one quotation from the evidence, given on oath, before the Ritual Commissioners, in proof that the pre-reformation vestments were valued, and the right to use them persistently claimed, solely because they symbolized the Sacerdotal system.

The Rev. Mr. Le Geyt was asked on what ground he thought it of great importance to re-introduce the eucharistic vestments, and he replied—for the edification of the people, and for the setting forth of the truths taught by the services more plainly and clearly. As to the change of colours at different seasons, he stated they had taken what is called the Western use; the Roman use more particularly. Pressed more closely, he admitted that the use of the chasuble implied the belief in the doctrine of sacrifice—eucharistic sacrifice—that being the object of a distinctive dress.

The statements of Mr. Bennett, of Frome, before the Commission, are too well known to need quotation: yet I am tempted to give one reply. He was asked if there is any doctrine involved in using the chasuble, and he replied—the doctrine of the Sacrifice—the priest offering a propitiatory sacrifice.

It will, of course, now be said, that these were but the eccentric exaggerations of a few. I reply that they were the *honest* outcome of the principles held, though more discreetly (or cunningly) veiled, (to use the language of a distinguished author, suddenly aroused to re-echo the warning voice of our dear departed friend, Mr. Colquhoun) by those who have learned the lesson of the Church of Rome, that where it can command the scale of power it will promote interference, and when it is in a minority will work for securing neutrality.

Dr. Pusey, at a meeting of the English Church Union, observed that it is the nature of Englishmen to acquiesce in anything; and that the public needs only a little leisure to get used to Ritual, to learn to tolerate, if not to love it.

The Church Association was called into existence to resist these efforts to destroy the Protestant character of the Church, and in this work we have had to deal with the entire question of vestments, as involved in the construction of the Ornaments Rubric.

On this occasion it would be enough for me to say that by judicial construction this Rubric is held not to legalize or sanction the use of the sacrificial Vestments as insisted on by the Ritualists. Relying on the acquiescent character of Englishmen, some even of the dignitaries of the Church have ventured to ignore that decision. Some assume the point of construction to be yet open. I shall not be tempted to descend from the high stand-point of judicial decision as regards the legal technicalities involved in this aspect of the vestment question. The appeal was to the

highest Court of the realm, and the decision was clear and unmistakable; and though great efforts have been made to explain away the effect, and force, of that decision, we are prepared to maintain its binding character.

What I purpose, however, is to develop, to the best of my judgment, the *mind* of the Church as illustrated by the *practice* of the Church. I adopt the assertion that these vestments have not been in use since the Reformation was settled, and my authorities are as follows:—

In a report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury on Ritual, I find these statements:—"The Committee think it well to lay down at the outset the general principle that the most important thing to be done is to ascertain whether any given practice is or is not agreeable to the mind of the Church of England. It is not sufficient that a practice be of great antiquity, or of very general prevalence in other parts of Christendom. After all, the question is, whether the Church of England has really retained, or by just implication recognised, the practice."

After observing that "it had been the custom of the Church from very early times, down to the period of the Reformation, to mark the superior dignity of the Holy Eucharist by the use of special vestments," the Committee state that "the general clerical vesture during the whole of the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, King James I., and King Charles I., was undoubtedly the surplice, in accordance (so far as relates to Parish Churches) with the advertisements of Queen Elizabeth, which, while ordering the use of the cope in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, enjoined the use of the surplice in all the ministrations of the Parish Churches; and this was subsequently embodied in the Canons of 1603." "There is abundant evidence to show that the Prelates of the period immediately succeeding the last Revision, recognized the surplice as the *sufficient* clerical vesture, whether in the celebration of the Eucharist or at other times; and this recognition appears to be fortified by the proceedings of some of the leading lawyers of the time, as evidenced in the Bills of Comprehension prepared by them in the year 1667."

Wheatly, writing in the reign of Queen Anne, speaks of the pre-reformation vestments as quite obsolete in his day.*

* While Wheatly made this admission, he adopted the construction of the Ornaments Rubric as enjoining *the use* of those Vestments. Hence I deem his admission to be of the greater value.

In an opinion as to the construction of the Ornaments Rubric given by Lord Selborne (then Sir R. Palmer) and other eminent counsel, on a case submitted on behalf of certain Bishops (no mere party statement), they define it as prohibiting the sacrificial vestments prescribed by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. and they add :—" This interpretation is supported by the universal practice which had prevailed from 1662 down to the present time (1866), and which affords a contemporaneous exposition of the Rubric to which great weight would be attached by every Court of law in England."

In the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, it was declared, as matter of history, that "from the promulgation of the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth in 1559, down to a very recent period, and notwithstanding the insertion of the Rubric regarding Ornaments in her Prayer Book, such of the Vestments in question as were, *previous to the Reformation*, (and still are in the Roman Catholic Church) held to be Sacrificial Vestments, have been totally abandoned by the Ministry of our Church." "With the Vestments also Altars were abolished, and all symbols of the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Mass." "That the Surplice was the only recognized legal vestment is further proved by the Injunctions and the Visitation Articles issued by the Archbishops and Bishops in their respective Dioceses immediately upon, as well as for a long series of years after, the passing of the Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth; all of which without exception are *directed against* the use of any of the Sacrificial Vestments, and enjoin and approve the use of the Surplice only." Again, their Lordships say :—"That, at the period of the Hampton Court Conference (the 1st year of James I.) which immediately preceded the Canons, the Surplice was the usual and only garment worn by the Clergy, is manifest, from the objection taken by the Puritans to its continuance; no other Vestment or garment being so much as named, while its continuance was however expressly provided for by the 17th, 25th, and 58th Canons of 1603."

Place this review of the practice of the Church side by side with the language of the Ornaments Rubric—" *shall* be maintained"—and we shall, I think, gather additional strength for that construction of the much debated rubric for which I contend.

Leaving to our opponents the attempts to place a gloss upon the Ornaments

Rubric which would gain sanction for the Sacrificial Vestments, I take my stand on the universal practice since the Reformation settlement, as the best and safest evidence for us of that compact. I am confirmed in this practical view by a resolution of the Convocation of York, passed in full Synod, in 1867—that it is desirable that the minister in public prayer, and in the administration of the sacraments, and other rites of the Church, should continue to use the surplice, academical hood, or tippet for non-graduates, and the scarf or stole, these having received the sanction of long continued usage. Also by the recommendation of the Ritual Commissioners, who reported that it is expedient to restrain all variations in respect of vesture from that which has been the established usage of the Church.

To meet the difficulties, Revision was recommended by the Commissioners, and that in a direction fully confirming the construction put on the Formularies, and the conduct of public worship adopted, by the Evangelical body. Convocation was permitted to consider these recommendations, and in the report of the Lower House of Canterbury, presented in 1872, almost all the leading suggestions of the Commissioners were repudiated. The Church Association has never advocated revision, being content to submit the Formularies to the test of legal construction; and it has secured the condemnation of all the sacrificial vestments, the turning of the back to the people, (euphoniously termed “the Eastward position,”) and various other sacerdotal symbols.

The subtle leavening process of the Tractarians, however, was made to advance overmuch. The growth of the bulb (I use Dr. Pusey’s figure) was too rapid, and the blossom of Ritualism burst forth before the poison plant had struck its roots sufficiently deep. The forbearing nature of Englishmen was outraged. Instead of acquiescing—instead of tolerating—instead of loving (as Dr. Pusey prophesied) sacerdotal doctrine, and its ritual symbols, the voice of the people, uttered in the Parliament of Protestant England, has unmistakably pronounced their determination to repress.

Hence the remarkable change we witness; and hence the suggestion emanating from certain considerate, if not very discreet, friends of the condemned Sacerdotalists, to secure standing ground for them on some space within the Church which may be declared to be neutral.

Thus we are met by the proposals (as to Vestments) made in the Upper House

of Convocation of Canterbury during this year, and referred to a select Committee of their Lordships. I will not read these resolutions, they have been published by the Association. In them we find that the Bishops of Lichfield and Peterborough venture to affirm that a large number of the clergy, and faithful laity, believe that "the use of distinctive dress" (mark the expression) in administering the Holy Communion, would tend to reverence and edification, and that it would tend to peace if such desire were granted. They give no clue to the nature and extent of the dress they would have sanctioned. The Bishop of Winchester however, in another resolution openly refers to the vestments introduced, as we have seen, from Rome, vainly seeking to blot out their doctrinal significance by the magic voice of Convocation. "This House declines to recognize them as symbolizing doctrines of any kind, but purposes simply to consider their general seemliness or expediency." Such an effort is surely either too simple, or too deep, to need further comment.

We are as yet in the dark as to what section of the clergy and faithful laity desire distinctive dress for the clergy when administering the Lord's Supper—as to *what* dress is desired. Why, if any special effect is supposed to attach to the garment, a comely surplice does not tend to reverence and edification, equally as any other distinctive dress—or how submission to the opinion of one section only of clergy and laity (howsoever faithful) would tend to peace.

We are *not*, however, in doubt as to who do *not* desire any alteration in the dress heretofore worn by the clergy in the Reformed Church of England—as to *what that* dress is, and how its continuance tends to decency and order—and as to the great contest that would arise in case the clamour of a few were to override the determination of the great mass of the faithful members of our Protestant Church. I call to witness the voice of Parliament during the last session, and the memorials in course of signature as prepared by the Church Association.

Can it be that our Bishops are so doubly afflicted—blind and deaf—as not to realize that any such attempt would be disastrous to the peace of the Church? It is idle to attempt to introduce distinctive dress for that Sacrament, which it is sought to elevate into the great central act of worship, and to cry, as to its significance—it is naught—it is naught. These things were put away because they were the symbols of blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

Where then is peace to be found? We enjoy the advantage of a settlement made so far back as the reign of Elizabeth. This was honestly observed until the sacerdotal leaven was introduced; since then all has been confusion. If time permitted, I might refer to the various phases of that settlement, as embraced in the Acts of Uniformity and the Rubrics and Articles; but I must pass these by, and confine myself to the practical question: Who will be satisfied by this distinctive, yet colourless, dress? How can it secure peace? Will such dress satisfy the cravings of the sacerdotalist for the sacrificial vestments? Will the compulsory disuse of the accustomed surplice satisfy the Evangelical minister? If there is to be a *discretion* as to the use, will such a severance of the tie of uniformity tend to peace?

Our Church is organized both as to doctrine and practice on a basis of uniformity, wide enough however to admit the three well known Protestant schools of thought. The Articles are the code avowedly made for the avoiding of diversities of opinion and for the establishing of consent touching true religion. The Rubrics are the written law for directing and limiting the performance of the services, rites and ceremonies of the Church. Are we to depart from this position whereby the services for worship are secured as common ground on which all members of the Church can meet? Perhaps the best evidence of the futility of any such attempt is to be found in the language of Dr. Pusey, published only a few days back. He says, "I wish no change in the Rubrics if the Law Courts will but allow freedom where congregations and clergy are of one mind," and yet he at the same moment proceeds to say that hitherto the only instinct of the Courts has been in favour of laxity. What he really wants is absolutism for doctrine which he is pleased to term Catholic truth, and laxity for practice which he considers to symbolize such doctrine. Future absolutism as to doctrine, because hitherto the Courts have recognized Evangelical truth. Future laxity as to practice, because hitherto the Courts have enforced the Acts of Uniformity.

Again, if a neutral ground is to be sought, can you stop at a distinctive dress and with the eastward position? The Bishop of London asked the question if a distinctive dress for the Lord's Supper, why not for the Sacrament of Baptism? The Archbishop of Canterbury puts the question, "If you think it desirable that any concessions should be made as to vestments, how do you propose that the demand should be met for the corresponding concessions on the other side at present

equally illegal?" Dropping the limitation as to illegality, I would ask if peace is to be sought by a change in dress, why not by a change as to some portions of our Liturgy? Are there not certain passages of equivocal import—passages which have been quoted in argument by the Sacerdotalists as justifying their return to the Pre-Reformation doctrine and practices, and which, while they cause pain to many within the Church, prevent approach from Protestant brethren from without? Since the sacerdotal poison was introduced, a suggestion was made by one who cannot be deemed as thinking on such a subject alone,—I allude to Dean McNeile—that the passages referred to should be placed between brackets, and the clergy authorized to read or not to read them according to their varying convictions. What also of the claims of the Liturgical Revision Society? Hear the language of the Broad School. One of their organs has just proclaimed, "While the Establishment exists at all, comprehension in a very large sense ought to be its chief rule in dealing with doctrinal questions." Revision in a retrograde sense had until now been confined to the Nonjurors and the Scotch Episcopalians.

An attempt was but recently made by the Bishop of Peterborough to secure a refuge of neutral ground, but he soon found that claims for this same privilege were far more numerous than he anticipated, and that in fact if once the door were opened for neutrality, it would not be possible to keep any order or quiet discipline in the Church. So then I conclude that it is our duty: it is the duty of the Church Association to continue its protest against the proposed innovation.

LORD'S SUPPER. A.D. 1674.

THE engraving on the third page is an enlarged but accurate copy from a copper plate in a small book printed in 1674, entitled, "A Course of Catechising; being the Marrow of all Orthodox and Practical Expositions upon the Church-Catechism." It purports to have been "gathered" from the following: Bishops Gauden, Andrews, Nicholson, Hall, Reynolds, Usher, Taylor, Prideaux, Morton, Davenant; Drs. Hammond, Pearson, Heylin, Sherlock; Mr. Nowell Dean of St. Paul's, Hooker, and other "Reverend Authors," some of whom, it will be observed, were decidedly High Churchmen.

It is quite evident that in the engraving the Lord's table is placed in the chancel "table-wise," and not "altar-wise," the two ends being East and West, and the two sides North and South. It is thus proved by high contemporary evidence that such an arrangement of the Table was the usual one, even in 1674, that is fourteen years after the Restoration of Charles II. Thus the minister who consecrated the bread and wine was able to follow the exact requirements of the rubric, and to stand at the *north side* of the table. The communicants, without any chancel rails, kneel, some of them at the west end of the table, and others, apparently at a little distance off, on the north and south sides of the table. To remove all further doubt of the importance then attached to this position we find the following question and answer on p. 300:—

“Q. Why doth the Priest stand on the North side of the Table?”

A. To avoid the Popish superstition of standing towards the East.”

The following questions and answers also exhibit the sound doctrine which was then taught:—

“Q. How do we verily and indeed receive CHRIST’S BODY AND BLOOD?”

A. By faith. The cup which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? who is present there.

Q. Believe, saith St. Augustine, and thou hast eaten. How many manner of ways may Christ be said to be present?

A. 1. He is present as God in all places. Ps. cxxxix. 7; Jer. xxiii. 24.

2. He is present as Man on the right hand of God, making intercession for us.

3. He is present by his grace in the hearts of believers. Ephes. iii. 17.

4. He is present by a special blessing, wherever two or three are gathered together in his name.

5. He is present effectually in the Sacraments. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.”

Another question and answer show what were “the vestments” used in the churches of 1674.

“Q. What think you of his habit, as his gown, surplice, and tippet? Can you hear him [i.e. the minister] in them?”

A. It’s no more to me what habit he prayeth or preacheth in, than it is to him what habit I hear him in: all our cloaths should be decent and comely: but the Word of God doth not depend upon the cloaths of men; his garments can no more hinder his preaching, than mine do my hearing.”

So the gown was evidently the well understood “Preaching Habit” of 200 years ago.



LORDS SUPPER.

A.D. 1674.

EXETER REREDOS CASE.

JUDGMENT OF THE LORDS OF THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL ON THE APPEAL OF PHILLPOTTS
v. BOYD AND OTHERS, FROM THE COURT OF ARCHES;
DELIVERED 25TH FEBRUARY, 1875.

Present:—LORD HATHERLEY, LORD PENZANCE, LORD SELBORNE, LORD
CHIEF BARON, SIR MONTAGUE SMITH, SIR ROBERT P. COLLIER.

This is an Appeal from a Decree of the Court of Arches, reversing an Order made by the Lord Bishop of Exeter, as Visitor of the Cathedral Church of St. Peter in Exeter, for the removal of a sculptured reredos recently erected at the east end of the choir of that Cathedral by the Dean and Chapter, on the ground that the sculpture, so erected, contains or consists of images, not permitted within churches by the law of the Church of England.

The Judgment of the Court below makes it necessary, in the first place, to decide whether the Bishop, as Ordinary, had a visitatorial power over the Cathedral Church of Exeter, with reference to the sculpture of which the Appellant complained, and whether, in the exercise of that power, it was competent for him, if he found that sculpture to have been unlawfully erected, to make an order for its removal.

The Respondents have contended throughout these proceedings, that the Bishop had no such power, and the learned Judge of the Court of Arches has so determined.

It is not, and indeed it could not be, disputed that, according to the General Ecclesiastical Law, "all Deans and Chapters are subject to the visitation of the Bishop, *jure ordinario*, and of the Archbishop of the province, *jure metropolitico*." (2 Burn's Eccl. Law, Phillimore's Ed. 1842, p. 93.) It is equally certain that as to some matters, at all events, the Bishop, visiting his Dean and Chapter as Ordinary, would have power to make orders binding upon the Dean and Chapter, subject to an appeal to the higher Ecclesiastical Tribunals. By the case of Dr. Goodman, reported in Dyer, p. 273 (the same law is recognized by Lord Holt in *Phillips v. Bury*, 2 T.R., 353), it appears that, before the Church Discipline Act, 3 & 4 Vict.,

mp. 86, this power would have enabled a Bishop, as visitor, to pronounce, in case of necessity, a sentence of deprivation against an offending member of the Chapter. Since that Statute it has been determined, in the Dean of York's case (2 Q.B., 1), that, in order to inflict any personal punishment for an ecclesiastical offence upon an individual member of a Chapter, the Bishop must proceed against him as against any other Clerk in holy orders, under the Church Discipline Act, and not as visitor. But the Statute leaves untouched all other power which the Bishop might previously have exercised in his visitation except this single power of proceeding against individuals by way of punishment.

Two arguments have been urged before their Lordships in this case against the Bishop's jurisdiction.

The first is that, although the Bishop may have power to visit the Dean and Chapter as Ordinary, and also power, in some cases, to make orders binding on the Dean and Chapter (subject to appeal), yet he cannot do so with reference to any part of the structure or fabric of the Cathedral Church. For such a limitation of the Bishop's visitatorial power no authority has been cited: and, considering the nature and importance of the duties which the Dean and Chapter have to perform with respect to the fabric of their Church, the burden of proof rests, in their Lordships' opinion, on those who, admitting the general visitatorial power, contend that it is thus limited. It appears, not only from the precedents in the history of the Cathedral Church of Exeter, to which their Lordships will have occasion to refer, but from the form of the Articles of Inquiry at the visitation of the Cathedral Church of York by Archbishop Harcourt, *jure ordinario*, in 1841 (which the learned editor of Burn's Ecclesiastical Law, edition 1842, vol. 2, p. 93, c., states to have been "framed in careful compliance with former precedents"), that the practice, in visitations of this kind, has been for the ordinary to include among the matters cognizable by him in his form of proceeding, the repairs, and generally the state and condition of the fabric, of the Cathedral Church. The reason of the thing, and all the authority which has been produced, is opposed to this first argument, which their Lordships, therefore, reject as untenable.

The other argument (and it is that which seems to have chiefly prevailed with the learned Dean of the Arches) is, that the Dean of Exeter has a peculiar jurisdiction, exclusive of the Bishop, within the "close" of the Cathedral Church, which (it is contended) includes the area and fabric of the Cathedral itself. Reliance, for this purpose, was placed upon an instrument of "Composition," dated in 1616, and purporting to be made between the then Bishop of Exeter, the Dean and Chapter, the Dean, the several Archdeacons of the Diocese, and the Custos and College of Vicars Choral of the Cathedral Church. Their Lordships were referred to what purports to be a copy of this document, printed in a note at pp. 232—236, of the 3rd vol. of Dr. Phillimore's Reports. It is hardly necessary to say that such a printed statement in a book of Reports could not be treated by their Lordships as in itself evidence, either of the existence or the due execution of such a document. The fact of its execution seems to have been challenged in the reported case. Their Lordships, however, understood the argument in the Court

below, and upon appeal, as having proceeded upon the footing of the execution and authority of such a document, and they therefore proceed to consider its value and effect. It was not alleged that the successors of the then Bishop of Exeter could, by the mere force of an agreement or composition of this nature, made in 1616, be ousted from any ordinary jurisdiction which they would otherwise have possessed; but the contention was, that this document is evidence of the previous legal existence of a peculiar of the Dean within the "Close" of Exeter, exclusive of the ordinary jurisdiction of the Bishop. Some of the remarks made by Sir John Nicholl, in his judgment in *Parham v. Templar* (3 Phill., 252), seem for this purpose to be important. This document, he says, "states that the agreement or composition is made upon a view of ancient usage, and upon searching and consulting proper authorities. But it does not state how far any such search was made, nor recite any particulars to prove this ancient usage. In short, whether it may not be altogether irregular and an usurpation, the instrument itself does not afford any means of ascertaining. The search was probably made, not by the Archdeacons or the Bishop or any of the Principals, but by their agents or officers,—possibly some practitioners in these Courts not very well read either in the canon or the civil law of the country." Upon these grounds, and on the further ground of the Metropolitan not being a party to the instrument, the learned Judge, in that case, refused to accept it as evidence that an Appeal from those Peculiars of the Dean and Chapter (such as Ashburton), which were exclusive of the Bishop's ordinary jurisdiction, would lie to the Bishop in the first instance, and not to the Metropolitan. Yet this seems to have been an inseparable part of the composition, considered as (what it purports to be) a general scheme for defining the manner and form in which the execution of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the several parties to it should for the future "be bounded, limited, and for ever thereafter used and exercised by the said parties and their successors;" and for the "clearing" of those "questions" which it recites to have been "then, and theretofore, moved between the same parties, touching the execution of ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the Diocese of Exeter;" "and for the settling and establishing a peace and certainty therein for ever thereafter between the said parties and their successors." The Court does not appear to have proceeded in the case of *Parham v. Templar*, upon the sole evidence of this document, so far as it recognized Ashburton as being a Peculiar of the Dean and Chapter, in which their jurisdiction was exclusive of the ordinary jurisdiction of the Bishop; and, in that case, no question whatever arose as to any jurisdiction either of the Dean or of the Bishop within the Cathedral Close or the Cathedral itself.

Supposing, however, that this composition could properly be accepted as evidence of some exclusive peculiar jurisdiction of the Dean within the Cathedral Close its terms must be accurately weighed to ascertain the true nature and character of that jurisdiction. The material parts of the composition are these:—

1. "That Matthew Sutcliff, Dean of the said Cathedral Church, and his successors, and his and their officer and officers, shall for ever hereafter, solely and without any concurrence, prove in common form all testaments" (except those of knights, beneticed men. and such as were *de robâ Episcopî*) "within the parish of Braunton

in the county of Devon, and the Close of the Cathedral Church of St. Peter in Exeter; and also, solely and without any concurrence, hear and determine, within the said parish of Braunton and Close aforesaid, all causes, as well *ad instantiam partis*, as *ex officio*."

2. That "within the residue of the Diocese, the Bishop or his Chancellor, solely and without concurrence, shall have power to dispense in all causes, to grant all manner of licences, sequestrations, and relaxations, and (generally) to do whatsoever is not formally declared to belong to the said Archdeacons, Dean and Chapter, Dean, and Custos and College, or to some of them, as aforesaid."

3. "Lastly, that the said Bishop, his Chancellor, or officers for the time being, shall and may, for ever hereafter, once in every three years complete, visit all the said Diocese, except the peculiars of the said Dean and Chapter, Dean, and Custos and College of Vicars, and their successors."

Unless, therefore, the visitatorial authority of the Bishop, as Ordinary, over the Dean and Chapter themselves, was, according to the true construction of this instrument, to be exercised by the Dean, as part of his peculiar jurisdiction within the Close of the Cathedral Church, it is not taken away from, but is (by the very terms of this instrument) reserved to the Bishop. "Peculiars," as Ayliff states (in a passage cited by Sir John Nicholl, at p. 245 of the judgment in *Parham v. Templar*), "are called exempt jurisdictions; not because they are under no Ordinary, but because they are not under the Ordinary of the Diocese, but have one of their own." The Ordinary of the Cathedral Close of Exeter, so far as it is described as a peculiar by this composition, was the Dean. But the only matters in respect of which the Dean was, according to the terms of the composition, to exercise ordinary jurisdiction within the Close, were the grants of probates, not of all persons, but of persons not falling within certain specified classes, and "the hearing and determination of causes," whether *ad instantiam partis* or *ex officio*. The composition does not provide that the Dean shall visit himself; still less does it provide that the Cathedral Church shall be exempt from all ordinary visitation, and subject only to the metropolitan jurisdiction of the Archbishop. It is further manifest, that if, by the terms of this composition, the Bishop, as Ordinary, had been excluded from visiting the Dean and Chapter or the Cathedral, it would have been a total, and not merely a partial exclusion. Any visitation of the Cathedral by the Bishop, as Ordinary, for any purpose whatever, would (in that view) have been quite as much *ultra vires*, as a visitation for the purpose of setting right whatever might be found wrong as to the fabric of the Church.

Passing from the letter of the composition itself to the evidence which is before us of the usage and practice, as to visitation, of the Cathedral Church of Exeter since the date of that instrument, their Lordships find that this evidence is altogether adverse to the contention of the Respondents. There is no instance given of the exercise of any jurisdiction by the Dean, except one case of brawling within the Cathedral, which arose in the year 1827, and which was manifestly "a cause," either *ad instantiam partis* or *ex officio*. Such a cause would no doubt have been cognizable by the Dean under the express terms of the composition if the Cathedral

ought to be deemed part of the Close, and it would have been equally cognizable, under the same instrument, by any Archdeacon of the Diocese, if the brawling had happened within one of that Archdeacon's peculiars. But there is no trace of its ever having been supposed or contended, before the arguments in the present case, that the Bishop of Exeter had not, over the Dean and Chapter, and within the Cathedral of the Diocese, as large and full visitatorial jurisdiction, as Ordinary, as any other Diocesan Bishop has in his cathedral church. That jurisdiction has been in practice, exercised on more than one occasion, without objection or protest, and its existence was expressly admitted, in the course of a recent public inquiry, by the Dean and Chapter.

In 1660 Bishop Seth Ward held a primary visitation of this Cathedral; and in the Articles then exhibited by him, inquiries were made (among other things) into the condition of the fabric generally, and of the roof, windows, seats, floors, towers, and bells. No question appears to have been raised as to his authority so to inquire.

In 1678 Bishop Lamplugh held another primary visitation of the Cathedral. Articles were exhibited on that occasion substantially similar to those of Bishop Ward (though not in exactly the same form); and, in addition to these, the second Article inquired "whether any passages or doors had been made in the times of the late rebellion, leading into the Cathedral by breaking down the wall thereof, and continued to be so?" The Dean and Chapter put in their answers to these Articles. As to the second Article they said "That there was only one door, towards the north-east, that was made in the late times, which had not been walled up (as another door then made had been), because it was a great convenience to several dignitaries of the Church and other persons of quality, and was neither indecent itself nor prejudicial to anybody." It appears, however, that by some objector, connected (as is to be presumed) with the Cathedral, a presentment was made against the door, which the Dean and Chapter thus desired to keep open, as having been improperly and illegally made through a private chapel at the north-east end of the Church, "to the dishonour of the Church," and to the prejudice of a particular family which had right of burial there. The Bishop, as visitor, adopted this latter view; and he thereupon ordered "that the said door be forthwith shut up, and hereafter not opened; and that before Candlemas next ensuing the aforesaid door be taken away, and the wall made up, and the passage restored to the right owner; and that the great gate next the street be by that time taken down and walled up." At a further visitation on the 21st April, 1680, it was finally certified to the visitor by the Dean that this order had been fully obeyed, and that the door in question had been walled up, as directed.

In 1852, the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, in answer to questions addressed to them by the Royal Commissioners for inquiring into the Cathedral Churches and Capitular Bodies in England, stated that the Bishop of Exeter was their visitor; and that the powers of the visitor were "those vested in him by the general law, not modified by any special custom." For the Dean, they did not then claim any peculiar jurisdiction, further than by stating that he had "archidiaconal authority within the Close;" which, however, was no longer exercised by him. In Bishop

Voysey's Statute of 1544 (to which they then referred, as the document in which the duties of the several dignitaries and officers would be most fully stated), the same statement is found, that the Dean had "*jurisdictionem Archidiaconalem in omnibus enumeratis infra clausum Exoniensis Ecclesiæ*," no other jurisdiction of the Dean being there mentioned.

Their Lordships are, under these circumstances, unable to agree with the opinion expressed by the learned Dean of Arches against the jurisdiction of the Bishop in the present case.

The right of the Bishop to visit, as Ordinary, in respect of the fabric being established, the question arises whether the order made by him for the removal of the reredos can be sustained. It was first suggested in argument that the Respondents were in the same position as if they were applying for a faculty to authorize its erection inasmuch as the erection without a faculty was illegal.

Their Lordships cannot accede to this argument of the Appellant's Counsel. It was pressed upon them in order to lay the foundation for an exercise of discretion on the part of the Bishop even in a case where there might be no breach of the law.

No authority has been cited, and no instance has been produced, in which a grant of any such faculty has been applied for, either in the case of Exeter Cathedral or of any other Cathedral, although it is notorious that important alterations in the fabric of most Cathedrals have continually been effected.

The argument, which was urged at the bar, that although a faculty may not strictly be necessary, the express or implied consent of the Bishop ought to be obtained for every alteration in the fabric of a Cathedral, was equally unsupported by authority; and their Lordships cannot, under these circumstances, conclude either that the Bishop, as Visitor, has a discretion to order any alteration in the fabric of the Cathedral Church, except on some definite legal ground; or that such a discretion, if not possessed by the Bishop, could be exercised by the Court of Arches, or by Her Majesty in Council, when adjudicating on an appeal from the Bishop's judgment as Visitor.

The case before us on the present Appeal must therefore be determined with reference to the question whether the structure itself is contrary to the Ecclesiastical Law.

For determining this question their Lordships have proceeded to examine the authorities and documents cited before them in proof of the alleged illegality of the Respondent's proceedings.

At the commencement of the Reformation attention was directed to the numerous representations in churches, either by sculpture or painting, or both, of those who were venerated either as Divine persons or as Saints of the Church, and to the outward acts of worship or honour paid to these representations or images. In the first year of Edward VI (1547) injunctions were issued to the Clergy and Laity by the King, with the advice of the Protector and the Council, purporting to be in continuation of like injunctions issued by Henry VIII, which, amongst other things denounced, as tending to idolatry and superstition, "the offering of money, candles,

or tapers to relics or images, or kissing or licking of the same." And the Clergy were directed to take down and destroy "such images as they know to have been so abused with pilgrimages or offerings of anything made thereunto, or shall be hereafter censed unto," and to suffer thenceforth "no torches or candles, tapers nor images of wax to be set before any image or picture," but only two lights upon the High Altar . . . admonishing their parishioners that images serve for no other purpose but to be a remembrance whereby men may be admonished of the holy lives and conversations of those that the said images do represent ; which images, if they do abuse for any other intent, they commit idolatry in the same.

By the 28th of these Injunctions the Clergy are ordered "to take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, tables, candlesticks, trindles, or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their Churches or houses." The execution of these injunctions was intrusted to the Ordinary, and Articles were framed to be inquired of in the King's visitation, one of which inquired, "Whether there do remain not taken down in your Churches, Chapels, or elsewhere, any misused images with pilgrimages, and whether do remain, not defaced and destroyed, any shrines, coverings of shrines, or any other monument of idolatry, superstition and hypocrisy."

A question has been raised as to the authority under which these injunctions were issued ; whether under the statute 31 Henry VIII, c. 8, giving to the King's Proclamations the force of law, or by virtue of the Act of Supremacy. The learned Judge in the Court below seems to treat the injunction as a Proclamation under the statute, which statute was soon afterwards repealed ; but whether it was so or not appears to their Lordships to be an inquiry not material to the present issue, for the reasons to be afterwards mentioned.

The next document relied upon by the Appellant is a Latin letter headed "Mandatum ad amovendas et delendas imagines" of Archbishop Cranmer to the Bishop of London, dated the 24th February, 1547, which recites (in English) letters missive (purporting to have been received by the Archbishop), signed by certain Lords of the Council, and containing the following passage:—

"After our right hartye recommendations to your Lordship, where now of late in the king's majestie's visitation amonge other goodlye injunctions commanded to be generally observed throughe all parts of this his highnes realme, one was set forth, for the taking downe of all such images as had at any tyme been abused with pilgrimages, offerings, or censings ; albeit that this said injunction hath in many partes of the realme ben wel and quyetlye obeyed and executed, yet in many other places muche stryfe and contentyon hath rysen and dayly ryseth, and more and more encreaseth, about the execution of the same, some men beyng so superstytious or rather wylfull, as they wold by theyr good wylls retayn all such images styll, although they have beene mooste manifestly abused, and in some places also the images which by the saide injunctions were taken downe, be now restored and set up againe, and almoste in every place ys contentyon for images, whether they have been abused or not ; and whiles these men go about on both sides contentyouslye

to obtayne **theyr** mindes, contending whether this or that **image** hath been offered unto, kyssed, censed, or otherwise abused, partyes have in some places been taken in suche sorte, as further inconvenyence is very like to ensue yf remedie be not provided in tyme; considering therefore that almost in no places of this realme ys any sure quyetness, but where all images be hoolly taken awaye and pulled downe already, to the intent that all contentyon in everye part of this realme for this matter may be clearly taken awaye, and that the lyvely images of Chryste shulde not contende for the deade images, which be things not necessary and without whiche the churches of Christ contynued most goodlye many yeres; We have thought good to signify unto you that his hignes pleasure, with th' advyse and consent of us the lord protectour and the rest of the counsell, ys, that immediately upon the sight hereof, with as convenyent diligence as you maye, you shall not onely give ordre that all the images remayninge in any church or chappell within your diocese be removed and taken away, but also by your letters signifie unto the reste of the bishopes within your province his hignes pleasure for the lyke order to be given by them and every of them within their several dioceses; and in th' execution thereof we requyre both you and the reste of the bisshopes foresaid to use suche foresight as the same may be quyetlye donne with as good satisfaction of the people as may be."

The Archbishop then directs the Bishop to proceed accordingly, and Articles appear to have been framed to be inquired of in the visitation of the Diocese of London; one of which is framed in the very words of the 28th of the King's Injunctions, so far as regards images.

Whatever may have been the legal effect of this mandate, it may be assumed that it was sent under the circumstances stated, and in consequence of the letter set forth as having been sent to the Archbishop from the Lords of the Council.

It appears plain to their Lordships that the Injunctions were directed (3rd and 28th) to the removal or destruction of such images only "as had at any time been abused" by superstitious observances; but the letter refers to the difficulty of distinguishing them from others, and to the pretext made for retaining some that had been "manifestly abused" by reason of their alleged exemption from abuse. Accordingly, it is directed that, in order to make sure of attaining the original purpose, all the remaining images should be then removed.

This order, or letter, then of the King's Council, explained as it is in its objects and intentions on the face of the document itself, appears to their Lordships to amount to no more than an administrative act or step taken at the time, for the time, and dictated by the necessities peculiar to the time. It did not contain, nor profess to contain, the enunciation of any general law of a permanent character with respect to images. It, no doubt, proceeded on the implied assertion that the worship or abuse of images was contrary to the true doctrine of the Church, then at the commencement of its Reformation. But it did not involve all images in a general condemnation, even by implication, for it distinguished between those which had been abused and those which had not, so far as condemnation went, and ordered the removal of all, whether abused or not for the sake of peace, and for

the purpose of insuring obedience to the former orders. Far from denouncing dead images as things unlawful, this document speaks of them "as things not necessary."

The Act of the 3rd and 4th Edward VI, intituled "An Act for the abolishing and putting away divers books and images," enacts, by the 1st Section, that all books (enumerating many) heretofore used for service of the church, written or printed in the English or Latin tongues, other than such as are or shall be set forth by the King's Majesty, shall be by authority of this present Act clearly and utterly abolished, extinguished, and forbidden for ever to be used or kept in this realm or elsewhere within any of the King's dominions.

The 2nd Section enacts that, if any person that then had, or thereafter should have, in his custody any such books or images of stone, timber, alabaster, or earth, graven, carved, or painted, which heretofore have been taken out of any church or chapel, or yet stand in any church or chapel, and do not before the last day of June next ensuing deface and destroy, or cause to be defaced and destroyed the same images and every of them, "and do not deliver up the books there mentioned in the manner and for the purpose of their destruction therein mentioned, he shall, for every book willingly retained in his hands, incur such penalties as in the Act mentioned." The careless wording of the Act, which omits all penalty with reference to images, induces a suspicion that the introduction of images into the Act was an afterthought; but, be this as it may, this Act would imply the necessity of all persons defacing or destroying or delivering up all images which had already been, or might afterwards be, removed out of churches, and probably, also, the obligation of removing those then remaining in churches, whether abused or not, except in cases falling within the exception of the 6th Section of the Act, which provides, that the Act shall not extend "to any image or picture or any tomb in any church or chapel or churchyard only for a monument of any king, prince, or nobleman, or other dead person, which hath not been commonly reputed and taken for a Saint, but that such pictures and images may continue in the like manner and form as if the Act had never been had or made."

The exception itself shows the generality in all other respects of the enactment as embracing all images; though it is remarkable that the excepted cases are referred to as occurring in any church or churchyard, whilst the rest of the Statute appears to be confined to images contained in or removed from the inside of churches or chapels.

This Statute was repealed by 1 Mary, sec. 2, c. 2, but that Statute was in its turn repealed by 1 Jas. I, c. 25, sec. 48, and the Statute of Edward was thereby revived. The Act of James I is itself repealed by the 26 and 27 Vict., c. 125. But an express section of that Act provides that, where any Act thereby repealed had the operation of reviving any former Act, such reviver shall not be affected. The Act of Edward VI, therefore, remains unrepealed.

It is in this state of circumstances that their Lordships deem it unnecessary to consider by what authority the Royal Injunctions and the Archbishop's mandate may have been originally issued.

Their Lordships concur in the opinion expressed by this Tribunal in *Westerton v. Liddell*, and cited by the learned Judge in the Court below, viz., that the Act "related to the destruction of images already ordered to be removed, but which either had not been removed, or, having been so, were still retained for private devotion and worship." It may be regarded as a recognition by the Legislature of the validity of these orders (though not expressly referred to), and of the obligation of obedience to them, but it does not go further; and, as with the mandate above referred to, so with this statute, it appears to their Lordships, that the efficacy of the Act of Edward was spent upon the definite purpose to which it was directed, and that the Legislature did not thereby make or intend to make, provision in respect of the subsequent use or abuse of any other images.

Up to this time then, viz., up to and including the Statute of Edward the VIth the case as to "images" stands thus—The King's injunctions in the first year of his reign condemned several superstitious practices with reference to images, such as pilgrimages to particular images, offerings made to them of any kind, kissing or licking, or censuring the same, and directed all shrines, pictures, paintings, and other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition to be destroyed by the Incumbent, so that there remain "no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within the churches or houses of their parishioners." The Metropolitan then communicated to the Bishop of London a letter received by him from the Privy Council, with reference apparently to what had been done under the Injunctions, and the difficulty of distinguishing images which had been abused from those which had not, which letter directs a total removal and destruction of all images. This is followed by the Statute, and so matters appear to have rested till the reign of Mary, when the Act of Edward was repealed, and the images, or some of them, were probably restored.

It is remarkable that nothing was done by Elizabeth with reference to the revival of the Act of Edward, but in the first year of her reign (1559) Injunctions were issued by her, the 23rd of which directed that the Clergy should take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, . . . pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses; and Articles, on the visitation of the Queen, were issued, founded on these Injunctions, the 45th of which inquired whether the Clergy knew any that kept in their houses any undefaced images, tables, pictures, paintings, or other monuments of feigned and false miracles, . . . and do adore them, and specially such as have been set up in churches, chapels, and oratories.

In the next year the Queen put forth the following Proclamation:—

"Elizabeth.—The Queen's Majesty understanding that by means of sundry people, partly ignorant, partly malicious or covetous, there hath been of late years spoiled and broken certain ancient monuments, some of metal, some of stone, which were erected up as well in churches as in other public places, within this realme, only to show ■ memory to posterity of the persons there buried, or that had been benefactors to the buildings or dotations of the same churches or public places and not to nourish any kind of superstition, by which means not only the churches and places remain at this present day spoiled, broken, and ruined, to the offence of all noble and gentle hearts, and the extinguishing of the honourable and good memory of sundry virtuous and noble persons deceased, but also the true understanding of divers persons in this realm (who have descended of the blood of the same persons deceased) is thereby so darkened, as the true course of their inheritance may be hereafter interrupted, contrary to justice; besides many other offences that hereof do ensue to the slander of such as either gave or had charge in times past, only to deface monuments of idolatry and false feigned images in churches and abbeys; and therefore, although it be very hard to recover things broken and spoiled, yet both to provide that no such barbarous disorder be hereafter used, and to repair as much of the said monuments as conveniently may be Her Majesty chargeth and commandeth all manner of persons hereafter to forbear the breaking or defacing of any parcel of any monument, or tomb, or grave, or other inscription and memory of any person deceased, being in any manner of place: or to break any image of kings, princes, or noble estates of this realm, or of any other that have been in times past erected and set up for the only memory of them to their posterity, in common churches, and not for any religious honour, or

to break down and deface any image in glass windows in any church without consent of the Ordinary, upon pain that whosoever shall herein be found to offend, to be committed to the next gaol. . . .”

The words “false,” and “feigned images,” which frequently occur in these documents, may either refer to images to which particular efficacy was falsely attributed, or (a meaning borne out by some passages in the Homilies) to images falsely alleged to be true likenesses of either the Saviour or any Saints of whom no true likeness existed. But whatever meaning be assigned to these words, the language of both the Injunctions and the Proclamation, is plainly addressed, not to all “pictures, paintings, or monuments, &c.,” but to a limited class of them, and this a class tainted with falsehood or superstition. As the Reformation proceeded, and the Articles of Religion came to receive statutory authority, the doctrine of the Church on this subject was plainly set forth.

The 22nd Article of Religion declares that “the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” In other words, it condemns only the abuse of images.

But great stress has been laid in the argument of this case upon the Homilies against the Perils of Idolatry, which are recognized in the 35th Article of Religion (amongst other Homilies) as containing “a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, and therefore are judged to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.”

The 46th and 49th Canons give special directions as to the reading of the Homilies, and the 80th Canon orders the Book of Homilies to be provided in each parish.

This recommendation, however, of the Homilies cannot be pressed further than as containing an approbation of “doctrines,” therein contained, and even that of a qualified character, as being specially necessary for the times when the Articles were framed and published. Now the Homily against the Peril of Idolatry (contained in several Parts) sets forth in very glowing colours the vanity and folly of paying adoration or worship to images or paintings, but it recognizes the original intention of such images or paintings to have been the better instructing of the ignorant, as set forth in the letter of Gregory to Serenus (cited by the learned Judge in the Court below). The Homily observes, “you may withal note that seeing there is no ground for worshipping of images in Gregory’s writing, but a plain condemnation thereof, that such as do worship images do unjustly allege Gregory for them.” The Homily, however, proceeds to affirm that the worshipping of images is a necessary consequence of their being allowed to exist, and therefore concludes strongly for their entire abolition, irrespective of actual abuse. Now it is plain that the “doctrine” maintained by the Homily is that of the 22nd Article, and condemns paying “honour and reverence to images as being an act of idolatry, and contrary to the Second Commandment.” In the judgment of its author the existence of any image, whether originally intended for instruction or not, is dangerous, as tending to idolatry. This cannot be called doctrine. It is an opinion as to the consequences which might at that time follow the use of representations of sacred objects, and probably the opinion might then be well founded; whilst it is, on the contrary, notorious that numerous sculptures and pictures representing the Saviour and Apostles and other holy men exist, and have existed for more than two centuries in and outside of our churches, to which no worship has been paid. The old associations were broken off, and the old “monuments of superstition” had either been removed, or become innocuous, before the reign of Elizabeth was closed.

In the 9th of Elizabeth, on a visitation by Archbishop Parker, Articles were exhibited, the 6th of which inquired whether any taught “that any man is borne with which do extol any superstitious religion or religious pilgrimages, lighting of candles, kissing, kneeling, or ducking to images.” And at another visitation in the 12th of Elizabeth, by the same Metropolitan, Articles were exhibited, by the 6th of which inquiry is made “whether images and all other monuments of idolatry and superstition be destroyed and abolished, and whether your churches and chancels be well adorned and conveniently kept without waste, destruction, or abuse of anything. Whether the rood loft be pulled down according to the order prescribed, and if the partition between the chancel and the church be kept.”

These Articles appear to observe the distinction noticed in the Queen's Proclamation already referred to between the representations which had been abused and those which had not. It is not improbable that there had existed some conspicuous representation of a crucifix in the rood-lofts which had been abused, and therefore was directed to be removed.

In Cardwell's "Annals" (Vol. I, No. LXXVII) are Articles intended to have been exhibited at Archbishop Grindal's visitation in the 18th Elizabeth, the 4th of which inquires "whether rood-lofts be taken down to the cross-beam," and the 6th inquires whether (amongst other things), "all images and other relics and monuments of superstition and idolatry be utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed, and if not, where and in whose custody they remain." It appears to be doubtful whether these Articles were ever exhibited. From this time, and notwithstanding the revival in the time of James I of the Act of 3 and 4 Edward VI, there appears to have been neither further legislation nor inquiry with reference to pictorial or sculptured representations of sacred subjects in churches.

What, then, is the character of the sculpture on the reredos in the case before their Lordships? For what purpose has it been set up? To what end is it used? and is it in danger of being abused? It is a sculptured work in high relief—in which are three compartments. That in the centre, represents the ascension of our Lord, in which the figure of our ascending Lord is separated by a sort of border from the figures of the Apostles, who are gazing upward. The right compartment represents the Transfiguration, and the left the descent of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost. The representations appear to be similar to those with which every one is familiar in regard to the sacred subjects in question. All the figures are delineated as forming part of the connected representation of the historical subject. The ascension necessarily represents our Lord as separated from the Apostles, who are gazing at Him on His ascent. As finials to the architectural form of the reredos, there is on each side a separate figure of an angel. It is plain to their Lordships that the whole erection has been set up for the purpose of decoration only.

It is not suggested that any superstitious reverence has been or is likely to be paid to any figures forming part of the reredos, and their Lordships are unable to discover anything which distinguishes this representation from the numerous sculptured and painted representations of portions of the sacred history to be found in many of our cathedrals and parish churches; and which have been proved, by long experience, to be capable of remaining there without giving occasion to any idolatrous or superstitious practices. Their Lordships are of opinion that such a decorative work would be lawful in any other part of the church: and, if so, they are not aware of any contravention of the laws ecclesiastical by reason of its erection in the particular place which it now occupies. Their Lordships have not adverted to the case of *Cook and others v. Tallent*, mentioned by the learned Judge in the Court below, because they have been furnished by the Registrar with a full note of that case, which appears to have proceeded on consent.

Their Lordships desire it to be clearly understood that nothing decided in this case affects the question of superstitious regard being paid, contrary to the XXIInd Article of Religion, to any representations or images that are, or may at any time be, set up in churches. The law will at all times be sufficiently strong to correct and control any such abuse: but their Lordships are of opinion that the sculpture in question is not liable to be impugned in that respect. Their Lordships will, therefore, recommend Her Majesty to reverse the decree pronounced by the Dean of the Arches, so far as it reversed the decree of the Lord Bishop of Exeter in pronouncing for his jurisdiction as Visitor and Ordinary of the Cathedral Church of St. Peter, in Exeter; but to affirm the decree of the Dean of the Arches in all other respects; and their Lordships, regard being had to the argument in the Court below and before them, in opposition to the jurisdiction of the Lord Bishop do not decree the payment of any costs of this Appeal by any party. Indeed, they understood it to be stated at the Bar, by the Counsel for the Respondents, that they did not ask for costs.

PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT.

ADDRESS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH ASSOCIATION TO CHURCHWARDENS AND OTHERS IN REFERENCE TO THE ABOVE ACT.

The Council of the Church Association desires to offer to Churchwardens and other members of the National Church, some hints as to the course it may be desirable to pursue when the Public Worship Regulation Act comes into operation on July 1st, 1875.

I.—The object of the Act is to provide a less expensive and more expeditious means of enforcing the observance of the law of the Church and thus more effectually to check any return to ceremonial practices symbolical of doctrines rejected by the Church at the Reformation.

It may be well to consider what was the occasion of the passing of the Bill.

It is well-known that there has sprung up of late years a party in the Church of England, anxious to deprive our Church of its Protestant character and bring us back to union with, which is in effect subservience to, the See of Rome. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York not long since admitted, in reply to a Memorial to which 60,000 names were attached, that there is "a considerable minority both of Clergy and Laity desirous to subvert the principles of the Reformation." The intention to destroy English Protestantism has long been openly avowed by the party in question. Of late years they have made more rapid progress. They now teach doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper scarcely distinguishable from Transubstantiation; the worship of the Virgin Mary, and other Romish errors, in churches and schools, of the Reformed Church of England; and, the hope has been expressed by the Romanizing party themselves* that "twenty years hence Catholicism will have so leavened the Church that she herself in her corporate capacity will be able to come to the Church of Rome and say, 'Let the hands which have been parted these 300 years be once more joined.'"

A consideration of the manner in which the Romanizing party has attained its present position shows how the danger has arisen

* Union Review.

which threatens the Church of England. It has come upon the country so gradually and insidiously as to disarm suspicion and opposition. In many cases, changes have been introduced by the clergy often against the will or without the concurrence of the churchwardens,—slowly and singly, so as to accustom the people by degrees to the ornate and symbolical ceremonial of the Church of Rome. These changes, sometimes trifling and apparently of no moment, have tended, perhaps in some cases unintentionally, to subserve the design of unprotestantizing the Church of England—a design which, when it is avowed or discovered, creates alarm and opposition among the laity.

Music, floral decorations, processions, peculiarities of dress, minute observance of the letter of the rubrics, or additions to the service in complete disregard of the authorized forms of Common Prayer—though the act taken singly and regarded alone may in itself be innocent and suited to the occasion—have often prepared the way for further changes neither innocent nor seemly. The result is that the clergy, in the solemn acts of public worship, are dressed like Romish priests—the churches are made to look like Romish churches—ceremonies, and sometimes even the order of service borrowed from the Roman missal, have been introduced into the Communion Service, as to make it (to borrow the words of Mr. Disraeli) “the Mass in Masquerade.” “High Mass and Low Mass are familiarly spoken of by the Romanizing party, the beginning of the Romish Service has been actually used,” wafers are given instead of bread, and “the cup” in which the wine is mixed with water, “no longer given into the hands of the communicants.” Altars have been substituted for Communion tables, they are placed upon steps, and surmounted by crosses and crucifixes, “in some instances a second and even a third altar is set up, one of them in honour of the Virgin Mary.” “Confessional boxes are thrust into our Churches, the Clergy dress themselves up in copes, albs, chasubles, and other vestments, and after the fashion of Romish priests, consecrate the bread and wine with their backs to the people.”

These innovations have been denounced in both Houses of Parliament, are repudiated by the great majority of the Bishops and Clergy, and have been pronounced illegal by the Ecclesiastical Courts, the state of the Law having been ascertained by the Church Association at a cost of £32,000. Still they are persevered in by the Romanizing Clergy in defiance of the law; and in order to the suppression of them it was found necessary by Parliament last year to pass the Public Worship Regulation Bill.

II. The mode in which the Act may be enforced also demands consideration.

1.—The supremacy of the law should be asserted and the Protestant character of the Church of England vindicated without regard to cost or personal convenience.

2.—It is desirable that every effort, short of any compromise of principle, should be made to settle the matter amicably, before having recourse to legal proceedings. Some of the Clergy it may be hoped

who have introduced into their churches unauthorised articles of furniture, or even Ceremonial, would yield to a friendly remonstrance from their parishioners.

3.—Failing this, the Act provides that the Archdeacon of the Archdeaconry, or one of the Churchwardens, or any three Parishioners, on their signing a declaration to the effect that they are members of the Church of England as by law established, may put the law in force.

If the Archdeacon declines to act, the Churchwarden and Parishioners should acquaint themselves thoroughly with the provisions of the Public Worship Regulation Act, a summary of which is appended hereto; and take the steps enjoined by the Act to enforce the law. Any information or assistance for a right understanding of its provisions will be furnished on application to the Secretaries of the Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London.

Parishioners have now the remedy in their own hands for any infringement of the legal order of Public Worship. The Law Courts have declared what the law is, Parliament has provided the means of enforcing it, the grave responsibility now rests with Churchwardens and parishioners of putting the law in force, and so maintaining and upholding the Protestant character of our Church, and the principles of the English Reformation. Their duty is clear—may God give them grace to act as men who value the civil and religious liberties of this Protestant kingdom, and are determined at all cost to uphold them!

SUMMARY OF SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS relating to the Institution of Proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act.

The Act provides that a representation may be made to the Bishop by the Archdeacon of the Archdeaconry, or a churchwarden of the parish, or any three parishioners of the parish, or in case of cathedral or collegiate churches by any three inhabitants of the diocese, being male persons of full age, who have signed a declaration that they are members of the Church of England as by law established.

The representation may relate to—

(1) Any alteration in or addition to the fabric of a church completed within the last five years, or to the ornaments or furniture thereof made without lawful authority, or to the introduction of any decoration forbidden by law.

(2) The use in any church or burial ground of any unlawful ornament of the minister, or the neglect on his part to use any prescribed ornament or vesture.

(3) Neglect on the part of the incumbent during the preceding twelve months to observe the direction contained in the Book of Common Prayer relating to the performance in any church or burial

ground of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the said book, or unlawful addition to, alteration of, or omission from such services, rites, and ceremonies made or permitted by the incumbent.

The representation must be signed by the person or persons making it, and accompanied by a solemn declaration affirming the truth of the statement made.

If the Bishop decline to allow proceedings to be taken, he is required to state his reasons in writing, and to send a copy of them to the complainants.

If the Bishop permit further proceedings, he is required within twenty-one days to ascertain whether the person complaining and the person of whom complaint is made, are willing to submit the question to his sole decision. If they agree to abide by his decision the Bishop will hear the matter in such manner as he shall think fit; and pronounce a decision from which there is no appeal.

If the parties agree together they may submit a special case, signed by a Barrister, for the decision of the Judge of the Provincial Court, whose decision will govern the judgment of the Bishop.

If the parties do not within twenty-one days signify their willingness to abide by the decision of the Bishop, the representation will be sent by the Bishop to the Archbishop to be heard and decided before the Judge of the Provincial Courts of Canterbury and York.

Note.—Every Clergyman when he is ordained Priest makes a solemn promise before God and the Bishop, so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and AS THIS CHURCH AND REALM HATH RECEIVED THE SAME; and the late Bishop Wilberforce warned his Clergy that they were in conscience bound to obey the law, as declared by the Law Courts, by their oaths and promises made at their ordination licensing, or institution.

The Law Courts have pronounced illegal:—*

Stone altars.

The Eastward position.

The elevation of the paten and cup above the head.

Prostration.

Wafer bread.

Mixing water with the wine at the Holy Communion.

Lighted candles on the communion table when not needed for giving light.

Incense for censuring persons and things at the Holy Communion.

The use of copes, albs, stoles, dalmatics, chasubles;

And other Romish vestments, &c. &c.

* See a very useful little publication, Church Association Tract, No. X., price 1d, to be obtained from the Secretaries at 14, Buckingham Street, Strand.

THE ERRORS OF RITUALISM HAVE THEIR SOURCE IN THE UNREGENERATE HUMAN HEART.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE REV. C. J. GOODHART, M.A.,

RECTOR OF WETHERDEN, SUFFOLK,

At the Church Association Conference held at Willis's Rooms,
King Street, St. James's, on the 12th of May, 1875.

IN examining any religious system, the question is—*first*, whether it is *altogether* of God, or *altogether* of the Devil; and if it be mixed—that is partly of the one and partly of the other—then *secondly*, to ascertain what in it is of the truth of God, and what in it is of the Devil's lie.

Now the Bible is *God's truth altogether*: and we may well say of Atheism, Infidelity, Heathenism, and some other systems, that they are *altogether* of the *wicked one*. But it has best answered the Devil's purpose to *mingle together*, as far as he could, truth and error, that is, God's truth and his lie; for he knows,

1. That a very little error spoils a good deal of truth:—
2. That under the guise of, or in connection with, a little truth, he gets an immense deal of error received and adopted:—
3. That he thus gets the human heart satisfied to remain as it is, under the delusion that it possesses religion enough to save it:—
4. That it is a matter of perfect indifference what the delusion is; though the more he can clothe the skeleton, or the putrid carcase of a dead soul, with the flesh that seems to the victim religious, the more secure he is of his prey: and of course he will suit the delusion as much as possible to the taste and fancies of the victim.

Ritualism and Popery are perhaps his masterpieces in this way; for, in these, with much that is true he has mixed up the most positive contradictions to the Word of God, and has linked with a portion of true Christianity the most palpable and fatal absurdities: and he works these in spite of knowledge, education, civilization, refinement, and common sense. He finds he can make the greatest fools of those whom the world and themselves reckon to be the most sensible, learned, acute, and well-informed; for he well knows the secret, that the carnal mind is *enmity* against God; and that, without grace, all the talents of men, however vast, and their natural excellencies however surpassing, only make them the more easy victims of his fearful delusions, and the fitter tools for working upon others to draw them into the same fatal net of destruction, in which they have themselves become entangled. Names will at once occur to you illustrating all this; but I forbear to adduce personal instances.

I have put Ritualism and Popery together; and we should not go far wrong if we were to say they are the same thing: but, at the same time, there is a serious difference. The moment a man becomes a Papist—and from the first, if he is born such—he is shut out as much as possible from all truth, and fortified in every way against it. The children of Romanists from their infancy are *educated* in Popery, and are taught so to deal practically with Protestantism and Protestants, as to expose them in the least possible degree to the probability of conversion. Many such therefore grow up in entire ignorance of the truth. But the Ritualists are living in the very blaze of God's truth. They have in our Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies, the pure gospel of the grace of God: they are bound to read the pure word of God in all the services of our Church; and yet they persist in shutting their eyes against the light; and even, as we have heard of wreckers, remove or intercept or confuse the beacons lamp of truth, so that instead of its being a guide to save, it becomes a decoy to inevitable destruction. Which are the worse of the two classes, in many—I do not say in all—cases, I leave you to determine.

But to come a little closer to our immediate subject:—"The errors of Ritualism have their source in the unregenerate human heart."

1. The first error I would here name is what our Church states in these words:—"The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it is commonly said, that the Priest

doth offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

This may be reckoned the fundamental error of the whole system, consisting of two parts, first, that transubstantiation is effected by the priest;—i.e. the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; the second, that there is the consequent offering of Christ for sin by the priest, being the *continuation* or *repetition* (for the distinction of these terms, lately attempted to be established in a criticism on the Bishop of Ripon is absurd and dishonest, and the latter after all is the truer of the two) of that one offering once for all of Himself on the Cross, by which He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

Now mark carefully what we have to say in reference to this; for I doubt whether the full error of this is discerned by many; and I do not remember to have seen it put as forcibly as it has struck me in carefully considering it.

The very essence, value, and power of the sacrifice of Christ was in His SUFFERING for sin:—and *this* word constantly occurs in reference to Christ. Luke xxiv. 46, "Thus it behoved Christ to *suffer*." Acts xvii. 3, "Christ must needs have *suffered*." 1 Peter ii. 21, "Christ also *suffered* for us." 1 Peter iii. 18, "Christ also hath *once suffered* for sins." And, remember, He bare our sins, and was made sin for us, not in a *formal* manner merely, but in that deep agony of soul which drew from Him the never to be forgotten cry—"My God! my God! why hast Thou forsaken me?" and the completion of the sacrifice was in the bloodshedding, for the blood is the life; and thus he laid down His life for us, sealing the atonement by His death.

Now, do you see the force of what I am saying? I deny that there is any sacrifice of Christ *without suffering*. It was the sacrifice of Himself in and by *suffering*, and that not the mere bodily suffering of crucifixion, but the deep unutterable agony of His soul as the sinbearer—all the agony of hell, which we had deserved, meeting in and upon that holy and spotless One, in that tremendously fearful season of the darkness of His soul and of the universe—it was *this*, which made His bloodshedding and death a sacrifice,—an atonement and propitiation for sin.

But how can there be any *continuation* or *repetition* of the SUFFERING? And yet if there is the slightest force or truth in what the Ritualists tell us, that the *sacrifice* is in any sense going on still, then I affirm—and I defy contradiction, that the *suffering* and the *wrath-bearing* must be going on still. But certainly this is not the fact. Look at this a little farther. The infinite singularity and uniqueness—if I may use the term—of the offering up of Jesus as the Lamb of God consisted in this that, owing to His infinite glory as Jehovah, by His infinite suffering not only was it an offering made *once for all*, but it became impossible that it could be any thing else, or need any thing to supplement it. But suppose that there was a repetition or continuation of that sacrifice, that is, suppose that the Ritualist's idea is true, *then* every time the priest, or any priest, offers Christ for the quick and dead, Christ SUFFERS, AND BEARS THE VERITABLE WRATH OF GOD, as He bare it on the Cross in its ineffable agony. You cannot have sacrifice without suffering; and if the suffering does not continue, neither can the sacrifice. On the other hand, in the Protestant—that is, the Scriptural—view, the Lord's people, in partaking of the bread and wine, fulfil by faith the Saviour's parting command, "Do this in remembrance of Me:" and it is impossible it can be anything but a *remembrance*; because the *wrath-bearing* and the *suffering* with the bloodshedding and death cannot be repeated; and all the transubstantiation in the world, however by a fiction it may repeat the latter, cannot approach a *holy* breadth to the repeating of the former. But it is necessary I should just add here, that *what that remembrance may be to us*, through the Holy Ghost, who brings all things to our remembrance, is quite another matter. Though there is no repetition or continuation of the sacrifice, yet while we "do this in remembrance" of Him, we do,—if really and truly His,—in the words of our Article, "rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, and the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." We do offer a sacrifice; but it is "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." The mere presentation of the symbols to God is nothing; there is no preciousness, no meaning, no congruity in such a thing, when He has His living Son—"a Lamb as it had been slain"—with Him at His right hand in His glory. These symbols are *for us*; and such presentation to God, as is made by the Ritualist, can only be an infinite insult and abomination, shewing the utter carnality and the fatal delusion of the heart that can offer them. Here we have, then, one clear illustration and

proof of the statement embodied in our subject; this error has its source in the unregenerate human heart; and the point we have been handling is the very pith of ritualism. Its Eastward Position and its Vestments are inseparably bound up with what we have been bringing before you. *They presume there is a sacrifice*; but we have proved this to be impossible unless Christ still suffers!

We proceed now to bring forward a few other illustrations of our subject, not unconnected with what we have already said. The characteristic of most of the Ritualistic errors, is *utter ignorance* of spiritual truth: at which, however, we are not surprised, when we recall those words of the apostle, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

We find, for instance, an utter ignorance of the *real character of God*. What is Ritualistic Service but another kind of heathenism, about which God expostulates so severely with His ancient People! Mark, in Isaiah xlv. 9-20, not a refined and subtil argument, but a strong and pointed appeal to their common sense, concluding with those remarkable words—"None considereth in his heart, neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say, I have burned part of it in the fire; yea, also I have baked bread on the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh and eaten it; and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? Shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?" Is not all this thoroughly applicable (*mutatis mutandis*) to those who worship the wafer? And is not the explanation of it precisely the same in the case of the Papist and of the idolator,—“He feedeth on ashes; a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?” Away with the mawkish apologies and excuses often made, by those who ought to know better, for Ritualistic idolatry; and let it be visited with the reprobation, freely expressed, of good Christian common sense. “Bring no more,” saith God, in the same Prophet, “vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; your new moons and appointed feasts my soul hateth;” and if He could speak thus, when these things had their place in the divinely appointed ceremonial, what would He not say, now that all these things are superseded in His Word (which, remember, gives us the true and earliest history of Christianity and the Church) by *simple spiritual service*, and *two ordinances*, which we call Sacraments, in perfect correspondence with such service? Throughout the New Testament we have no ritual. How utterly do Ritualists ignore Christ’s weighty and decisive words—“God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him, *must* worship Him in spirit and in truth.”

Again, there is utter ignorance of the *real nature of sin*. Even the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin; how much less the mummeries, and attitudes, and processions, and elevations, and prostrations, which must occupy all thought, and make the service oscillate between a wearisome performance and an amusing entertainment!

How would the soul, if truly regenerate, instead of going back to beggarly elements, leap for joy at finding itself freed, as in our Scriptural Protestant service, from all such bondage of externals, and privileged to walk in the blessed liberty of simple worship and loving spiritual fellowship! How can a heart have ever truly ached for sin, or a soul felt itself hopelessly lost, that can play with sin in this way, and make a pastime of ordinances, in which, to a living faith, pardon is to be sealed and grace is to be imparted!

Again, what ignorance is manifested, in this fearful system, of all atonement, first, in its suffering; and, secondly, in its sufficiency. As we have already seen—how entirely the pretended offering of Christ, by the Romish or the Ritualistic priest, ignores the essential feature of suffering! And what can the wrath of God be, if it can be thus mitigated and appeased at the will of a priest and subject to his performance?

We can scarcely forbear to notice on this occasion the fearful abominations of the Confessional. How can any, that possess the blessedness of the pure in heart, who now live near to God, and shall see Him for ever, and are ever looking to the grace of Christ, and the strength and comfort of the indwelling Spirit to overcome and mortify their hated corruptions, not dread, with infinite recoil, for themselves and others, such certain and inevitable pollution. What are we not bound to think of those, and of their system, who encourage intercourse, reeking with filthiness, and setting up a moral mortification in all the faculties of thought and feeling! The arrogating, too, to man in this, as well as in other things, the prerogative which belongs only to God, is another unmistakable feature of the unregenerate heart.

Again, the lowering down spiritual communion with God, so as to be dependent on the mere contact of matter with our bodies, in the eating of the bread, and the drinking of the wine, cannot be conceived as co-existing with divine grace. How singularly has the Word of God met by anticipation these grossest notions of the carnal mind! "Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man," was Christ's own statement, when discussing meats, and His appeal to the common sense and universal conviction of His hearers; and we should justly demand, that it should have been most unequivocally revealed—before we could be warranted in believing it—that anything entering in by the mouth into a man could cleanse or sanctify or save him, any more than that it could defile him.

A total want of sympathy with the universal experiences of the Apostles, as evidenced in their Epistles, and of all their faithful followers ever since, is another marked feature in the adherents of ritualism; and, I may add also, their consequent denial of the *experience*, in a real child of God, of the work of the Holy Ghost, and fellowship with Jesus. This is no matter of surprise; for wherever *externals* can occupy and satisfy the Ritualist as they do, he cannot have felt those deeper needs and heartlongings, which find their satisfying in nothing less than Jesus Himself, and in the fellowship of that Spirit, who takes of the things of Christ, and showeth them to us.

And it is only in entire keeping with all this deadness to and denial of spiritual life, that with such persons there is little or no separation between things sacred, and things most trifling and worldly. Both are confounded together in the experience and practice of the Ritualist. The holy and the worldly are both viewed by him from the standing point of the *flesh*; and therefore he finds no difficulty in combining the one with the other; while the true children of God, those that are heartily and soundly evangelical, must and do come out and are separate, not touching the unclean thing; and are thus as much disliked and hated, with but few exceptions, as were our Lord and His Disciples by the Scribes and Pharisees. It was Christ's object to purchase unto Himself a Church, "an holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual* sacrifices, acceptable to God by Christ Jesus;" and what Christ has given to His Church by the Holy Ghost comprises *all spiritual blessings*, for which they may look and ask without limit; but our condition is one of *fallen flesh*; and He has accordingly given us what that flesh needs, but no more—namely, two simple, significant, and instructive ordinances, which we call sacraments; and nothing beyond. It was *fallen flesh* that was to be dealt with; and therefore, in His loving dealings with us, there must be fixed boundaries and due restrictions, so as to help the spirit without encumbering it. In the resurrection body, all will be different. Whatever may be the perfection and adornments of that outer world, the perfected spirit will never swerve from its perfect love, perfect worship, perfect service; and the resurrection body, fashioned like to the body of Christ's glory, will ever be its helpmeet, and never its burden. Here, in the present condition, in those who are truly *converted* to God, all His *spiritual* provisions are welcomed and realised, and the true life is felt to be the *spiritual* life; and the *outward* things are taken in moderation and used within limits, even in connection with religion itself, as in the case of the sacraments. In the *unconverted*, *outward* things are understood, enjoyed, and appropriated, as natural and suitable and sufficient; and they constantly invade the province of religion; while *spiritual* things are either *rejected* by the *infidel*, or *carnalised* by the *papist* and *ritualist*, who know no other use for them.

I make two remarks in conclusion:—

1. In speaking of Ritualists, it should be remembered, that all do not go to the same length; and if we have to deal with them *personally*, we must be careful to seek grace to act and speak wisely according to circumstances. "On some have compassion, making a difference."

2. Of what moment it is, that those who really are the Lord's own children, born of the Spirit, and savingly united to Christ, should walk worthy, come out and be separate, and possess real spiritual affections; that they may not put a stumbling-block in the way of Ritualists and others; but be able to exercise a holy influence, through the power of their spirit and conduct, to bring them, if it be the Lord's will, to Christ, and thus to save their souls.

THE PRESENT TACTICS OF THE RITUALISTS
AND HOW TO MEET THEM.

PAPER READ BY THE REV. W. F. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D.,
VICAR OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S EVERTON, LIVERPOOL,

At the Church Association Conference held at Willis's Rooms,
King Street, St. James's, on the 12th of May, 1875.

WHEN first I was asked to open this subject, the word "present" was not contained in the title. I thought we were to consider the tactics of our opponents in general, rather than any mere present phase. I think it will be well therefore in the first place to occupy a few minutes with the former as a fitting introduction to the latter.

In considering the tactics of the Ritualists we must ever have prominently in our mind what is their ultimate aim and object. Happily we have no longer to *infer* that object and design from their method of procedure, though it would be perfectly legitimate and logical to do so. The effect may be as fairly inferred from the cause, as the cause from the effect. And if we see a course of proceeding adopted by intelligent agents, the only natural effect of which must be to produce a certain result; it is an insult to their understanding not to suppose that such a result was designed. But happily, as I have said, there is no necessity whatever for the exercise of any process of logic in the case; the object, aim, end, and design are openly avowed.

What then is the ultimate end aimed at? It is nothing less than to undo the work of the Reformation.

"Anglicans," says Mr. Blenkinsop, "are reproached by Protestants with their resemblance to Romans; they say a stranger entering into a church where Ritual is carefully attended to, might easily mistake it for a Roman service. Of course he might: *the whole purpose of the great revival has been to eliminate the dreary Protestantism of the Hanoverian period and restore the glory of Catholic worship.*"

The Rev. G. Nugee declares before the Ritual Commissioners that "*our whole object and desire is to restore the Church of England in her beauty and her ritual to what she was before the Reformation.*"

Mr. Bennett in his examination states that "the contest on the subject of whether the vestments and ritual observances should be retained is a struggle between Catholicity and Protestantism," and that "every English clergyman is to work up to the use of Sarum," i.e. the pre-Reformation Missal, "as fast as he can get the people to join with him." He also states that "the Mass is now offered daily on our altars by himself and others," and adds, "at all this the world stands aghast." Of this, then, there can be no doubt. The common sense, intelligence, and honesty of the world stand aghast at the contemplation of the moral, or rather immoral monstrosity of English clergymen, sworn to the Thirty-nine Articles of religion, and notably the *thirty-first*, openly boasting that they offer the mass daily on the altar. They have done more to shock the common honesty of mankind than the most scandalous transactions on the Stock Exchange; for they act thus in the sacred name of religion.

"Who," says the *Church Times* in its plan of the campaign, "will be leader, who will go out against the Goliath of Protestantism and be champion for cowering Israel? Churches like St. Alban's, Holborn, and St. Lawrence, Norwich; books like the Altar Manual and the Priest's Prayer Book, fairly represent the most advanced post yet reached by the Catholic revival in England. They are not the ultimate goal. The final aim, which alone will satisfy the Ritualists, is the reunion of Christendom, and the absorption of Dissent within the Church . . . Nothing short of that will be enough . . . but the hardy veterans of a forlorn hope are not enough to charge the whole army of Protestantism, in position." The aim then is the overthrow of Protestantism and reunion with Rome; and that now means submission to an infallible Pope. Though I believe many of the Ritualists want Popery without the Pope, so as to be Popes themselves.

Well might the two Archbishops in their reply to our memorial say, "There can be no doubt that the danger you apprehend of a considerable minority both of clergy and laity amongst us desiring to subvert the principles of the Reformation is real."

Should the Ritualists, unhappily, succeed in their designs (*absit omen*) we cannot plead ignorance of the sort of treatment we should get from the dominant party, if the *Church Times* represents their views. In the number for April, 23rd ult. we have a review of Dean Hook's last volume of the Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and referring to the returned Marian exiles, it says, "if Elizabeth had strung them up upon their disembarking, she would have averted countless sins and sorrows," and that "Dr. Hook's present view that Queen Mary was only too lenient was the true one. As for the Marian Martyrs they were the scum of society and deserved what they got, only unfortunately the severity of their punishment created a reaction in their favour."

It is well to remember that the returned Marian exiles whom Elizabeth ought to have strung up, included such men as Archbishops Sandys and Grindal, Bishops Jewel, Pilkington, Coverdale, &c.

There can be no doubt now of the ultimate goal. The mask which was worn so long is now openly laid aside, we have not to contend with a veiled Romanism but with an open enemy, and the struggle is for life.

But now for the tactics in general by which this aim is to be accomplished.

1. By the principle and practice of *gradual innovation*, gradual change in the conduct of divine worship, and this is a plan which has but too fatally succeeded. Countless instances there are of churches where once plain congregational services were to be found, to the comfort and edification of the faithful; but which have been gradually pushed on and up until nearly all the distinctive features of Ritualistic worship are found. It is a great pity that some Evangelical men have yielded to the movement, to some extent, in introducing and adopting changes in that direction. It is one thing to tolerate some practices, not wrong in themselves, which have been introduced before our time, and to which people have become accustomed. It is another to innovate in that direction ourselves. We hear a great deal of "bright and hearty services," but I have very grave doubts if such are really attractive for good. Of course histrionic services will always attract those whom the theatre and the pantomime would attract; and to about the same advantage. But the crowds who often attend a Wesleyan chapel are not brought thither by what Ritualists and their imitators would call bright and hearty services, for there are neither surpliced choristers, candles, nor flowers; but by the simple preaching of the Gospel, and the hearty congregational singing of Wesley's hymns.

2. By the extensive circulation of little manuals of devotion and catechisms, such as "The little Prayer Book," "The Plain Guide," "The Church Catechism with Pictures," "The English Catholic's Vade Mecum," "Steps to the Altar," "Eucharistic Delights," &c., &c., in fact their name is legion. Near every Ritualistic church you will find (*more Romano*), a depôt where manuals, pictures, crosses, crucifixes and all the trumpery of Popery are provided for the silly birds which are caught with such chaff.

3. Dishonest quotations, bold denials or confident assertions, are amongst the weapons in constant use from the Ritualistic Arsenal. Thus in Mr. Gresley's work on Confession, Jewel is quoted as in its favour, so are Ridley and Latimer and other Reformers. One has only to read the context to see that the words do not bear out the practice in support of which they are quoted, *e.g.* in p. 49, Jewel is quoted as saying: "Touching the third (private confession) if it be discreetly used without superstition or other ill, it is not in any wise by us reprovèd—the abuses and errors set apart, we do no more mislike a private confession than a private sermon." The quotation is accurate, but it is mutilated. Jewel speaks of three kinds of confession, "the first made secretly unto God, the second openly before the whole congregation, *the third privately unto our brother!*" It is of this last and not of auricular confession to a priest, with a view to sacerdotal absolution, that Jewel is speaking, and he adds: "Thus much only we say, that private confession to be made unto a minister is *neither commanded by Christ nor necessary to salvation.*" (P.S. vol. iii. p. 351.) Is this method of quotation honest? I have long ceased to place any reliance on any Ritualistic quotation, until I had first verified not only its verbal accuracy, but its relation to the context.

4. The Establishment of Guilds, confraternities, sisterhoods and brotherhoods, are among the most effective methods adopted by the Ritualists. They know the power of organization and association, and avail themselves of it with great success. The C. B. S. and the E. C. U., the Guild of the Holy Cross, and the G. S. A. Guilds for Boys and Guilds for Girls; Guilds for Railway Porters, and Guilds for Printers' boys; the S. H. C. and the S. N. F. In fact their guild movement is one of the

most striking features of the great Ritualistic conspiracy. *The Church Guilds Directory* is now published for the first time, and informs us that there is a Union of Church Guilds consisting of 170, of which 74 are for men, 38 for women, and 51 mixed, 7 not specified; returns for men give 1866 members, for women 1468, mixed 3488: total 6822. Add to these, those from which there are no returns, and the result will show probably not less than 10,000 persons male and female enlisted in this net-work which covers the land, for the overthrow of our Protestant Christianity.

5. Educational Institutions and Schools for middle classes are part of their permanent tactics. I have no sufficient data to give particulars, but the evil is a serious and a growing one, and requires urgent steps to counteract it.

6. One more of the ordinary tactics is to avoid inconvenient controversy. An illustration of this happened to myself. At a meeting in Liverpool I had occasion to quote from p. 111 of the *Directorium Anglicanum*, to show that the word *Transubstantiation* was adopted by Ritualists. In due time a letter was published by an anonymous correspondent, from the Rev. Dr. Lee, the Editor, to say that my quotation "was not honest, as the passage in question was from the Cautels of the Mass, an old Church of England document, set forth in his work to illustrate the practice of the Pre-Reformation Church, and no more." I at once wrote to Dr. Lee very respectfully asking him to point out in his work any qualifying clause such as he stated, as I had quoted the passage in perfect good faith, believing that it represented his views or at least was not opposed to them. To this I got the following:—

"All Saint's Vicarage, + St. Andrew's day, 1874.

Rev. Sir,—I take leave (and ask your pardon for so doing) to *decline controversy* with Protestants of all denominations. Your most obedient servant,

FRED. GEORGE LEE."

I commend that method of getting rid of an inconvenient controversy to the consideration of all whom it may concern. It saves a world of trouble, and you cannot possibly be vanquished by your opponent. Whether it will ultimately serve your cause is another question. However, in this case, I was saved all further trouble too, and sent the correspondence just as it was to the newspapers for the public to draw its own conclusions.

Secondly.—I proceed to point out some of the salient points of their present tactics.

1. Among them stand prominently out to view their persevering efforts, through their apologists and sympathisers in Convocation and elsewhere, to get legal toleration for their distinctive practices under the plea of reasonable liberty and that comprehensiveness which are the proper characteristics of a national Church. The battle is just now being fought around the Mass Vestments, and the Altarwise position of the officiating clergyman. At present and as the law has been authoritatively declared by the highest Court of Appeal, both of these are illegal, and it is of the very greatest importance for the Medievalists and Sacerdotalists in our Church to get them legalized: or as it has been put by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, to get the existing diversity of practice so far recognized as not to interfere with it where it exists; and to leave all future cases to the discretion of the Ordinary. Now we, the faithful and loyal sons of the

Reformers, must be firm on these two points. They are the Malakhoff and the Redan of the enemy. If beaten there, they are defeated all along the line; and our duty with respect to them is perfectly plain. There must be no compromise and no surrender, no hesitation and no neutrality. When the Israelites went forth to battle the officers were directed to address their men, and say—"What man is there that is fearful and fainthearted? Let him go and return unto his house, lest his brethren's hearts faint as well as his heart." So would we say now. Let the fainthearted return and leave the field to men who will have no compromise with Rome, no complicity with idolatry. This is not the day for men who, "like the children of Ephraim, who being harnessed and carrying bows turned themselves back in the day of battle." Timid counsels will only tend to weaken. We have no desire to narrow by a hair's breadth the wide limits of the Church of England; but we cannot make them wider. They are broad and comprehensive indeed, but they do not contain the Vestments and the Sacerdotal position. Our Church is comprehensive, but she is not as regards Rome a compromise. At one stroke of the pen in the year 1552, *Altar*, *Altar position*, and *Altar Vestments* disappeared from the Prayer Book, and they have never been restored since, notwithstanding the efforts of Laud and his party, and, God helping us, they never shall be.

2. Another of their present tactics is to bully those in authority and threaten disestablishment, unless their demands are granted—so Canon Gregory stated in his speech in Convocation—the Ritualistic clergy, he said, "outwardly conforming would remain in their cures and labour for Disestablishment." One of their publications, advertised in "The Church Times," is entitled "*The Eve of the Battle: a Truce or Disestablishment*," in which the writer pleads for toleration on the ground that if it be refused they will virtually join the Liberation Society. I think many of those who use this argument are perfectly sincere and are prepared to act as they say: but their threats have not a feather's weight with me for three reasons: first, because the truth and purity of the Gospel of Christ are dearer to me than Establishment; secondly, because if the Church be purified, we can laugh their threats to scorn; and thirdly, because I am perfectly convinced that unless this "counterfeiting of the Romish Mass" be put down, disestablishment will come sooner or later. It will be but a question of time. To preserve the Establishment therefore of our time-honoured National Church we must listen to no suggestions for compromise on this matter. The late Bishop of Winchester, I believe, once said, "unless these men abide in the ship we cannot be saved." I venture to say that unless these Jonahs be cast overboard the ship cannot weather the storm. It was St. Paul who said, "I would they were even cut off who trouble you." I, too, wish that those who are labouring for the de-Protestantizing of our Church were cut off from a communion with whose fundamental principles they have no sympathy, and who abuse their position to deliver her into the hands of her enemies. Yea, rather would I that they themselves should perceive their present inconsistency, and like honourable men retire to more congenial quarters.

3. The Fabian policy of delay and evasion is signally manifested at the present time. I need do no more than refer to the course pursued by the English Church Union in reference to the cases now before the Courts: the Mackonochie, Parnell, and Prestbury cases. Appeals are made on the most frivolous pretexts, so evidently

so as to incur the censure of the judges, and all for the only apparent object of gaining time; meanwhile labouring with might and main to fortify and extend the position they occupy, so as either to influence the final decision before it comes, or to make it a dead letter after. Surely it argues a conscious weakness in the inherent strength of their cause to act in such a manner. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God;" and he that believes that his cause is the cause of truth and law and right will not condescend to the quirks and captious evasions of an Old Bailey lawyer, but will come forward and give every facility to have his cause tried. And when it is tried, he will not dishonourably seek to evade it, by a pretended literal compliance whilst he violates its spirit, but will honestly submit to it, or retire.

4. Their deliberate resolve is however not to leave the Church of England—so Archdeacon Denison informs us. "One Bishop," he says, "had publicly advised all Ritualists to depart from the Church of England. He was sorry for the Bishop's sake that he had given the advice, but *they were not going to take it.*" A writer in the Church Times advocates the policy of *passive resistance* in the event of any attempt to enforce the Public Worship Regulation Act. He calls on his brother priests simply to ignore any action on the subject, just go on as before until compelled to desist by police intervention, in which case he desists just as long as the policeman's hand is on his collar, and then he is to resume again. He apprehends that people will soon get tired of that sort of persecution. On the subject of persecution a leading Ritualist said to Canon Gregory that "he hoped they should be well persecuted, for persecution so largely increases their influence." It would be a pity then to disappoint their hopes; and so far from railing at us as some do, it appears that we deserve their thanks. Canon Gregory said that he "verily believed that the Church Association had been the great preacher of Ritualism." This is a new character to sustain, but we are too old to be moved from our purpose by such a charge. The fact is, this is the well known method which Rome always adopts with respect to her opponents, and I am surprised that so learned a man as Canon Gregory does not know it, or forget it, though no doubt he was quite sincere in saying so. I have heard the same thing said over and over again, that Rome is largely indebted to Dean McNeile, Dean Close, and the late and ever revered Hugh Stowell; but if so, I could never reconcile this with the fact that notwithstanding all her deep obligations to these illustrious servants of God, she poured out all her vials of wrath on their devoted heads.

5. Another tactic which Canon Gregory informs us is in reserve is the following: "Extreme Ritualists," he says, "will resort to other methods of teaching doctrine which he could not. What would prevent a whole congregation from falling down on their faces and worshipping? and they distinctly stated that they were prepared with other means of that kind in which the laity could show forth uncontrolled the doctrine they loved, whilst the clergy *would outwardly conform and remain in the Establishment.*" And what we may ask are we to think of the honesty of men who contemplate such an unworthy and dishonourable procedure: and is it desirable to sacrifice the principles of the Reformation to retain such men in the Church? Are not those men rightly called traitors who remain in the Church to inculcate disloyalty?

6. One more tactic may be mentioned, and that is to support some such measure

as Mr. Salt's Bill for promoting facilities for Public Worship. I am not insensible to the present grievances under which members of the Church of England labour when a parish is in the hands of a Ritualistic priest, and they have no choice but between that and Dissent, if even the latter. But still it will be an evil day when the Ritualists shall be able under the legal sanction of a sympathizing or good-natured Bishop to run up a duly licensed Mass House under the shadow of the Protestant Parish Church. The English Church Union has directed its branches to consider the desirability of rendering a general support of Mr. Salt's measure.

I have left myself but small space for the consideration of this important question "how to meet these tactics." I shall merely enumerate, and leave to others to fill up.

1. By an extensive use of the press, especially in the circulation of tracts, pamphlets, and small, cheap, neatly bound attractive manuals. In this respect we may profitably copy the example of the enemy, *fas est et ab hoste doceri*.

2. By an extensive and well sustained system of lectures, meetings, sermons, and above all, instruction classes for the dissemination of the distinctive doctrines of the Church in contrast to Ritualistic error.

3. Akin to the former, may be mentioned systematic catechising of the young in our National Schools on the part of the clergy and in the Church on Sunday afternoons. The Catechism and the thirty-nine Articles will supply abundant materials for sound Evangelical instruction.

4. By the calm, dignified, but determined and resolute enforcement of the law under the Public Worship Regulation Act, as soon as it comes into operation. Our lay brethren have an opportunity now such as they never had before. Let them take wise but prompt steps to use it. The Bishop of Carlisle has publicly declared that in certain circumstances he would cut off his right hand before he would consent to proceed against a clergyman for the altarwise position. I hope that on reconsideration he will not persist in this resolution. The people of England will not allow the laws to be suspended by any authority whatever in favour of those who would deprive them of their legal rights, viz. Public Worship according to the simple, solemn ritual of the Protestant Church of England. The supremacy of the Queen, i.e. of the Law, over all states and degrees, must be maintained at all hazards, and clerical lawlessness restrained.

5. By steadily shutting our ears to all appeals from whatever quarter for co-operation with disloyal members of the Church. Our rulers deprecate parties and deplore what they are pleased to call party spirit. If zeal for the principles of the Reformation be an evidence of party spirit then we must be content to bear the stigma. But how can two walk together except they be agreed. We may not plow with an ox and an ass together, we must not sow our field with divers seed, nor wear a garment of divers sorts as of woollen and linen together. Discrimination and separation, not confusion and amalgamation should be the order of the day. It may be very agreeable to some, but it does not tend to the real extension of Christ's kingdom, to see men, not merely of various shades of opinion, but of antagonistic principles engaged in a common mission to evangelise the masses or spread the Gospel among the heathen.

6. We should be ready, if occasion arise, by a large and concerted movement to restore the table to its rubrical, canonical, and historical position in the body of the

Church at the celebration of the Lord's supper, viz. tablewise, with its end east and west, and thus bring to a conclusion this painful controversy as to the meaning of a rubric, and demonstrate to the eye as well as to the ear how we can at once "stand before the table" and "break the bread before the people." The *Christian Observer* for May in an interesting article on the Ritual controversy, publishes an admission of Mr. Morton Shaw on this subject. "I must not however," he says, "conceal my opinion that if the old Puritan arrangement of the table were now in operation, *the whole of the Rubrics would be at once brought into perfect harmony.*" To the same effect is quoted Mr. Beresford Hope, that "*if the Table is to stand altarwise, the other Rubrics can with difficulty be reconciled with it.*" Quite so. Why then should the table be allowed to stand altarwise if it gives us all this trouble and controversy. It is a harmless position enough in itself, but if it be the pretext for converting the sacrament of the Lord's Supper into the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, we may be compelled sooner or later, as Mr. Shaw expresses it, to revert to the old Puritan arrangement. And yet we deny that it was the Puritan arrangement, it was the arrangement of the Marian Martyrs, the men who drew up the North Side Rubric. It was an arrangement which was in general operation as late as 1641, as is evidenced from the canon on the subject drawn up under Laud's influence. Yea, we find unmistakeable evidences of its operation in the Tablewise position after the last revision in 1662, (vide Bishop Williams' book "The Holy Table," 1683, and "A Course of Catechising," 1674. *Church Association Monthly Intelligencer*, March, 1875.)

7. One more method by which we may endeavour to meet the present tactics of the Ritualists is by *organization*. Let every town, every village, every parish have its auxiliary to the Church Association. No words can tell how much England and England's Church owes to this organization. It has vindicated the Protestant character of our Church and checkmated the designs of the enemy. Destroy it not, a blessing is in it. Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all. Let us extend her organization; until like a net work it covers the land with a noble army of valiant soldiers determined to stand firm in defence of the Gospel, and to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Dr. Lee says, "*We,*" [the Ritualists] "*are teaching men to believe that God is to be worshipped under the form of Bread, and they are learning from us the lesson which they have refused to learn from the Roman teachers that have been amongst us for the last 300 years. On any hypothesis we are doing their work.*" This witness is true. Here are men teaching a most degrading form of idolatrous worship, and avowedly doing the work of Rome. Can anything more be wanting to stir us up to the work of resistance?

But all our efforts must be vain without prayer to God; and therefore in His name let us go forth against this multitude. This is our main line both of defence and attack. I have not dwelt on it, for it is obvious to all. But without persevering prayer all our best schemes must be futile; therefore "watch, pray, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

THE SACRIFICIAL VESTMENTS.

REASONS AGAINST, BY THE REV. R. P. BLAKENEY, D.D., LL.D.,
VICAR OF BRIDLINGTON, YORKSHIRE.

The Rubric of 1559. 1604.

"And here it is to be noted that the Minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VIth, according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

The principal Vestments which have been illegally re-introduced into the Reformed Church are the Chasuble, Albe, Tunicle, and the Cope.

1. The *Chasuble* is the distinctive official Vestment of a Sacrificing Priest.

2. The *Albe* is worn by the Priest under the Chasuble.

3. The *Tunicle* is the Vesture of Ministers assisting the Sacrificing Priest.

4. The Cope, illegal except on special occasions in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, is a non-sacrificial Vestment.

The Rubric of 1662.

"And here it is to be noted that such Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be RETAINED and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth."

The following propositions give the leading historical facts as to the above rubrics:—

FIRST PROPOSITION.

The First Prayer Book, of Edward VI, A.D. 1549, retained "the White Albe plain," with "the Vestment (Chasuble) or Cope" as the distinctive dress of the Celebrant in the Communion Service: also "Albes with Tunicles" for the assistant Priests or Deacons.

In this book the term "Altar" was retained with other distinctive portions of the mediæval Canon. (*a.*)

This book came into force by authority of Parliament, in the second part of King Edward VI.

(*a.*) *The following is an extract from the Canon in the Sarum Missal.*

"Which oblation do thou, Almighty God, vouchsafe in all respects (here he makes the sign of the cross over each saying) to + bless, ap+prove, ra+tify, and accept, that it may be to us (here he makes the cross over the bread) the + body (and here over the chalice) and + blood (then he joins his hands continuing) of thy most beloved son Jesus Christ our Lord."—(*Walker's Liturgy of the Church of Sarum*, p. 65. London, Hayes.)

The following is an extract from the prayer of consecration in the Book of 1549.

"Hear us O merciful Father we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ."—(*Liturgies of Edward VI.* p. 88, P.S.)

The Priest, according to the Sarum Missal, offered "of the gifts bestowed upon us a pure sacrifice."—(*Hostiam.*)

The Priest, according to the book of 1549, "turning still to the ALTAR," said—"We thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make."—(*Ut supra.*)

SECOND PROPOSITION.

The second Prayer Book of Edward VI, A.D. 1552, forbade the use of these Vestments, and required the Surplice to be worn by Priests in all ministrations. The term "Altar" was expunged, and also the distinctive characteristics of the mediæval Canon.

After Queen Elizabeth's accession the Prayer Book of 1552 was adopted, but the Queen had, at first, some scruples as to the exclusion of the Vestments, and in order to avoid a rupture, and allow time for reflection, a new rubric on Ornaments was introduced in the Prayer Book issued, A.D. 1559, retaining the Ornaments which were appointed "by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.," meaning those of the book of 1549, but with the important proviso, "*according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book.*" This was the Act of Uniformity, which gave authority to the Queen, with the advice of her commissioners, to "TAKE OTHER ORDER." (a.)

(a) "Provided always and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church and the Ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI. *until other order* shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the great seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this realm."—(*Act of Uniformity, Liturg. Services, Eliz. p. 32, P.S.*)

THIRD PROPOSITION.

The Queen, with the authority required, did take "other order" by means of "The Advertisements" of 1564-5, the effect of which was to limit the Cope to *Cathedral* and *Collegiate* Churches, while the Surplice was enjoined in Parish Churches. (a.) Pursuant to these Advertisements, Chasubles, and Tunicles were destroyed by authority, and Copes forbidden in Parish Churches. (b.)

(a) "Item. In the ministration of the Holy Communion in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the principal minister shall use a cope with gospeller and epistolar agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at that Communion table, to use no copes but surplices. * * *

"Item. That every minister saying any public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charges of the parish."—(*Advertisements of 1564-65. Sparrow's Collection.*)

The Canons of 1604 are much to the same effect. They prescribe the use of the Cope in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in communion on "principal feast days."

(b) Grindal, Archbishop of York, 1571, enquires—"Whether all Vestments, Albes, Tunicles, Stoles, . . . be destroyed."—(*2nd Ritual Report*, p. 408.)

The chasuble was known as "the Vestment."

Aylmer, Bishop of London, 1577, enquires—"Whether all Vestments, Albes, Tunicles, Stoles . . . be destroyed."—(*Ut supra*, p. 418.)

Sandys, Archbishop of York, 1578, enquires in the same words.—(*Ut supra*, p. 423.)

Overton, Bishop of Lichfield, 1584, enquires—"Whether Vestments (sic) . . . or any other reliques or ornaments of idolatrie be either knowne or suspected to

remain in any man's hands."—(*Ut supra*.) It is unnecessary to quote other articles of Bishops on this point.

As to Copes, Grindal enquires in 1576—Whether the Minister "do wear an Cope in your Parish Church or Chapel."—(*Remains*, p. 159. P.S.)

Piers, Archbishop of York, 1590, enquires—"Whether all Copes . . . be destroyed."—(*Quoted by Robertson on the Liturgy*, p. 84. (Lond. 1869, in which see other authorities.)

In the year 1572, the Vestments and other "Popish trumpery," says Strype, were discovered in Cambridge, and with "the whole consent of the heads of houses," were committed publicly to the flames.—(*See Strype's Life of Parker*, p. 399. Vol. I.)

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

The Homilies, which were directed to be read in all churches, referred to the mediæval vestures as inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel (a.), and the Canons of 1571 forbade them. (b.)

(a.) "Likewise were the vestures used in the Church in old time very plain, and single, and nothing costly. And Rabanus at large declareth that this costly and manifold furniture of vestments of late used in the Church was fet (fetched) from the Jewish usage, and agreeth with Aaron's apparelling almost altogether. For the maintenance of the which, Innocentius the Pope pronounceth boldly, that all the customs of the old law be not abolished, that we might in such apparel, of Christians, the more willingly become Jewish."—(*The 3rd part of the Homily on Idolatry*.)

(b.) The Convocation of 1571 forbids the use of "any garment defiled by superstition," and requires that all "shall use in their Churches only that linen vesture which is still retained by Royal command." It sanctions the gown in the pulpit.

FIFTH PROPOSITION.

The Puritan opponents of the Church in the reign of Elizabeth, referred only to the Surplice in Parish Churches, and the Cope in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches as objectionable vestures. The selected Champions of the Church, while they defended the Surplice, declared that the Church had rejected "the Massing Levitical apparel." (a.)

(a.) Cartwright says:—"All the service and administration is tied to a surplice; in cathedral churches they must have a cope." (*Whitgift's Works*, p. 459, Vol. III. P.S.) He refers further to the Lutherans as defending "real presence in the bread of the supper and images and vestments." (p. 549.)

Whitgift, the Champion of the Church, afterwards Primate, says:—"Which this Church hath refused . . . God be thanked, religion is wholly reformed even to the quick in this Church." (p. 550 *ut supra*.)

Cartwright quotes from Bullinger, Pastor of Zurich, who says, "We (the Helvetic Church) do worthily reject that *Massing Levitical Apparel*."

Whitgift replies, "Neither do we retain the *Massing Levitical* apparel, but that apparel only which Bullinger himself alloweth of in divers epistles." (*Ibid*.)

SIXTH PROPOSITION.

The Rubric was revised in 1662. The parallel at the head above shows the change, and as thus revised so it now remains.

The distinction between the Lord's Supper and other ministrations was obliterated in 1662, while the Vestments were limited to such as had been REVERBINED. (a.) See Lord Selborne's opinion below.

The Sacrificial Vestments had been disused for a hundred years. (b.)

The Rubric of 1662 omits reference to the Act of Parliament (1) because the "other order" had been taken, and a new act (1662) was passed, and (2) because the Rubric was re-constructed.

(a.) "V. The words of the so-called 'Ræbric' of 1662, when accurately weighed, do not seem to me to be intended, nor to be apt in themselves, to *restore* anything which at that date was not 'retained,' and in use in the Church of England. An enactment that certain things 'shall be retained and be in use' naturally implies, that the former state of things is, so far, to be continued; not, that a new state of things is to be then introduced, or (what amounts to the same thing) that an old state of things, long before prohibited by law, and also disused in practice, is, for the future, to be revived and brought into use again."—(*Sir Roundell Palmer's Opinion*, p. 139, 1st *Ritual Report*. See also *Sir Hugh Cairns' Opinion* to the same effect. *Ibid.*)

(b.) The word "retained" cannot apply to that which was not in use by authority. The case of 1662 is very different from that of 1559. In 1662, the vestments had been disused by authority for a hundred years, but they had been in use when the act of 1559 was passed. The word retained would cover the vestments in 1559, but not in 1662.

SEVENTH PROPOSITION.

The Visitation Articles of the Bishops, after the revision of 1662 (some of these Bishops having been amongst the revisers), defined the surplice and hood, or tippet, as the only proper ornaments of the clergy in ministration, (a.) and there is not a single instance since 1565 in which any Bishop enjoined the Sacrificial Vestments. These Articles were republished with the Report of the Ritual Commissioners in 1868.

(a.) Cosin enquires, "Have you a large and decent surplice, one or more, for the Minister to wear at all times of his public Ministration in the Church." (p. 601, 2nd *Ritual Report*.) Bishops Piers, King, Ward, Croft, Sanderson, Lloyd, Skinner, &c., in the same year make the same enquiry. (p. 615, *ut supra*.)

EIGHTH PROPOSITION.

The reintroduction of the Sacrificial Vestments would involve a complete revolution in the doctrine and ritual of the Church, (a.) at variance with the known sentiments of the great majority of Churchmen, as well as of the millions of Protestant Nonconformists.

(a.) First proposition and notes.

NINTH PROPOSITION.

1. The use of the vestments is designed to imply the doctrine of sacrifice. The Rev. C. J. Le Geyt, before the Ritual Commissioners, said:—"I should certainly think the use of the Chasuble would imply the belief in the doctrine of sacrifice—Eucharistic sacrifice—that being the object of a distinctive dress." (1st *Ritual Report*, p. 16.)

2. The meaning thus avowedly attached to the Vestments would (if the suggested concession were made) be indirectly inculcated by the order of the Church. This is precisely what was decided in the Bennett case to be inadmissible.

3. The restoration of the Vestments is a return to practices discarded by the Church at the Reformation on the very ground that they inculcated doctrines which the Church had ceased to sanction.

4. A concession to those, who have avowed their hostility to the Reformation, cannot be safe, and would lead to agitation in every parish.

THE EASTWARD POSITION.

REASONS AGAINST, BY THE REV. R. P. BLAKENEY, D.D., LL.D.,
VICAR OF BRIDLINGTON, YORKSHIRE.

*Rubric as to the position of "the table"
and of the Minister.*

"The Table at the Communion time having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in *the body* of the Church, *or* in the chancel, where Morning prayer and Evening prayer be appointed to be said. And the Priest standing at the *north side* of the Table, shall say the Lord's prayer, with this Collect following."

*Rubric as to the position of the Minister
when ordering the elements.*

When the Priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, *that* he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread *before the people*, and take the cup into his own hands, he shall say the prayer of consecration, as followeth.

The following propositions give the leading historical facts as to these Rubrics.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

The Eastward position is regarded by the majority of those in our Church who seek to reintroduce it, as significant of the sacrificial office of the Celebrant—"offering before the Lord *for* the people." (a.)

(a.) The Ritualistic Catechism, "the Ritual Reason Why," contains the following question and answer:—"Why is the Priest to say it (the prayer of consecration) standing before the Altar? *Because this is the position of a sacrificing Priest.*" (p. 136.)

SECOND PROPOSITION.

This position was retained in the Prayer Book, A.D. 1549, which also retained the term "Altar" and certain sacrificial vestments, with some portions also of the mediæval canon of the Mass. (a.)

(a.) See paper on Vestments.

THIRD PROPOSITION.

The rubric in the Prayer Book of 1549, which required the celebrant to "stand humbly afore the midst of the Altar," was expunged, and the book of 1552 provided that the Communion "Table" shall stand "in the body of the Church or Chancel," and directed that the celebrant shall stand at "*the North side.*"—(see Rubric above.)

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

The Prayer Book of 1552, with some modifications, was adopted in 1559. "The holy table" was moveable, according to the Injunc-

tions of 1559, and frequently stood east and west, or lengthwise, in "the body of the Church," the Rubric directing the celebrant to stand at the North side of the Table. (a.) The Eastward position was regarded as essentially Romish. (b.) Archbishop Laud created great public discontent in the reign of Charles I. by his efforts to locate the table as a *fixture* in the Chancel with its ends North and South. (c.)

(a.) The Injunctions of 1559 directed that "the holy table" shall occupy the accustomed place "save when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed, at which time, the same shall be so placed, in good sort, within the chancel, as whereby the Minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministrations, and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the said Minister."—(*Sparrow's Collections*, p. 83, 1671. See also Canon 82.) The Interpretations of the Bishops in 1561 directed "the table" to "be removed out of the choir into the body of the Church before the chancel door, where either the choir seemeth to be too little, or at great feasts or receivings; and at the end of the Communion to be set up again according to the Injunctions."—(*Cardwell's Doc. Annals*, i. 205.)

(b.) L'Estrange says:—"As for the Priest standing at the north side of the table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the Priest standing with his face towards the east, as is the Popish practice." So the *Collections* of a learned man."—(*Alliance of Offices*, A.D. 1659.)

(c.) Heylin quotes the strictures of the opponents of Laud, who "obtained an order of Council in the case of St. Gregory's for the transposing of the Communion table to the place of the Altar."—(*Life of Laud*, p. 106.) Heylin had been Laud's Chaplain and Friend.

FIFTH PROPOSITION.

At the Restoration in 1660, several leading Churchmen (following the Canons of 1640 passed by the influence of Laud, but which have no legal force) were favourable to the location of the Table as a fixture in the Chancel or upper part of the Church, while others (adhering to the rubric, and the orders of the Lords Temporal and Spiritual in 1640) were favourable to the retention of the liberty given in the Rubric and Canons of 1604. (a.)

(a.) "Die Lunæ, I. Martii, 1640. It is this day ordered by the Lords Spirituall and Temporall in the high Court of Parliament assembled, that every Lord Bishop in his severall Diocese shall give directions and take care that the Communion-table in every Church in his Diocese do stand decently in the ancient place where it ought to do by the law, and as it hath done for the greater part of these three-score years last past." (Order of the Lords against the Laudian innovation.—*2nd Rit. Rep.* p. 556.)

SIXTH PROPOSITION.

An attempt was made in Conyocation in 1661 to alter the rubric which related to the position of the table, so as to make the table a fixture in the upper end of the Church, and the words "north part" were substituted for "north side" with reference to the position of the celebrant. (a.) The rubric was however restored to its original form.

(a.) "The table . . . shall stand in the most convenient place in the upper end of the chancel (or of the body of the Church where there is no chancel.) And the Priest, standing at the north part of the table shall say." (Proposed Rubric.)

SEVENTH PROPOSITION.

The side Rubrics relating to the manual acts (*i.e.* the breaking of the bread before the people and the taking of the cup and paten into the hand) were introduced in 1662. The Puritans had complained that there were no such acts. (*a.*) The preceding rubric directs the Priest to order, that is, to arrange the elements; the special object of which ordering is stated as follows: "that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people and take the cup into his hands," obviously meaning that the people may see the action. But the people can not see the action, if the Priest stand with his back to them. (*b.*)

(*a.*) The Puritans complained:—"We conceive that the manner of the consecrating of the elements is not here explicit enough, and the Minister's breaking of the bread is not so much as mentioned."—(*Cardwell's Conf.*, p. 321.)

(*b.*) It has been asserted that the words "before the people" mean that the breaking of the bread is to be performed in the church, and not in the vestry, but the assertion is groundless! (1.) Neither Romanists nor Puritans performed the act of consecration in the vestry. (2.) The side Rubric provides for the breaking of the bread in the prayer of consecration which is said in public.

Reynolds and the Puritans were in favour of the manual acts. It has been asserted that Cosin composed the rubric. (1.) If this were so, it would tell rather against the Eastward position, for Cosin was ready to make "some moderate concession" to the Puritans. (*Baxter's Life and Times*, p. 210, vol. i. Lond. 1830.) (2.) But there is no ground whatever for the assertion. It might as well be said that Bishop Reynolds, the Puritan, composed it.

EIGHTH PROPOSITION.

The Revision of 1662 had in view the table as standing with its ends North and South, a custom which then existed in some places as well as the custom of standing with its ends East and West. It is to be noticed that the terms of the rubric are fulfilled literally when the Minister, *for the purposing of ordering the Elements*, stands "before the Table," whether it be placed with its ends East and West, as it used to be, or with its ends North and South, as it now is.

NINTH PROPOSITION.

The reason of the introduction of the words "before the table" is manifest. The normal position of the Celebrant is at the North of the Table, but, by the Rubric requiring the manual acts, introduced in 1662, he is set free from that position to give him an opportunity of ordering the Elements which may be beyond his reach from the North side. Celebrants know by experience the necessity of obviating this difficulty, and the indecency of stretching over the Table. But it was desirable to provide for this exceptional change of position by a rubric to protect the Minister from a charge of standing with his back to the people, when necessity requires him so to do during the ordering of the Elements. (*a.*)

(*a.*) Wren, when charged with consecrating at the west of the table, gave as his reason that "the elements stood upon the table further from the end thereof than he, being but low of stature, could reach over his book unto them, and yet still proceed on in reading of the words without stop or interruption."—(*See Robertson on the Liturgy*, p. 202. Lond. 1869.)

TENTH PROPOSITION.

The reason, stated in the Rubric for the ordering of the elements, namely, that he may "with the *more readiness and decency* break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands," means that he may conveniently reach them in the prayer of consecration; but this reason would not apply, if the Minister, in the said prayer, stood with his back to the people, as in that case the elements would be under His hands without any change in his position. (a.)

(a.) Robertson remarks as to the breaking of the bread "before the people," that if it "meant no more than *he* ought to be seen by the people, while standing in such a position that his action can not be seen, it is impossible to imagine why it should have been inserted; for it has never been the practice of the Western Church that the Priest himself should be out of sight."—(*Ut supra*, p. 203.)

ELEVENTH PROPOSITION.

The works of Divines, contemporaneous with the introduction of the Rubric, show that it was intended that the manual acts should be visible to the people, which would be impossible if the Celebrant performed them while standing with his back to the people, or between them and the elements. (a.)

The Puritans and opponents of the Church after 1662, offered no objection to this Rubric, and the proposed Prayer Book of 1689, revised to satisfy Dissenters, changed the word *Priest* to *Minister*, but *left the rubric untouched in other respects*. (b.)

(a.) Bishop Gauden, one of the leading Revisers of 1661, and by whose influence mainly the Post Communion Rubric was restored (Blakeney on the Prayer Book, pp. 137, 143, 3rd edition) says:—"At the time of the consecration fix your eye upon the elements."—(*The Whole Duty of a Communicant*, quoted by Perry. *Declaration on Kneeling*, p. 318. Lond. 1863.)

(b.) See the book published by Seeley. London.

TWELFTH PROPOSITION.

The back turned to the people (save for arranging the Elements) has been unknown as a practice in the Church of England, until recent innovations, for the last 300 years. (a.)

This position, if legalized, being essentially a retrogressive measure, would place the Church at variance with the general sentiments of the nation, and bring about consequences that can be more readily conceived than satisfactorily expressed.

(a.) Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews, expresses his opinion that the Purchas judgment is right, and says:—"And among other reasons for thinking so, the following appears to me unanswerable—I assume the practice of our twenty-four English Cathedrals as giving us the surest rule, because the practice being not of an individual but of a corporation, is least liable to change. Now it is certain that *before* the Reformation the Eastward position was the invariable use in them all; and it is no less certain that *since* the Reformation the use of the north end position has been in them equally *universal*, and is so still, except that of late years in three or four Cathedrals the eastward position has been partially introduced."—(*Letter to Mr. B. Hope*, June 4th, 1874.)

To be obtained at the Office of the Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, London.
By Subscribers, for distribution, free. By others at 3d per dozen, or 1s 6d per 100.

18th Thousand.]

THE PAST ACTION OF THE CHURCH ASSOCIATION,
AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING IT IN
INCREASED EFFICIENCY IN THE FUTURE.

BY THE REV. G. W. WELDON, M.A., VICAR OF ST. SAVIOUR'S,
CHELSEA.

Paper read at the Church Association Conference held in Hope
Hall, Liverpool, on the 17th and 18th November, 1875.

WE cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that we have reached a point in the conflict between Sacerdotalism and Christianity, where retreat is impossible. It is hardly necessary to observe that Sacerdotalism is incompatible with Christianity. The New Testament teaches that there is no sacrificing priest but Christ, no sacrifice for sin but that which He made, "once for all," upon the Cross, and no Altar but that on which He died. Sacerdotalism, on the contrary, exalts a sinful creature into the office of Confessor, Intercessor, and Sacrificer,—or, to use the words of a Ritualistic Catechism of Theology, "The Priest at the Altar is virtually Jesus Christ Himself." Our Church does not speak too strongly when it defines such theology as "a blasphemous fable, and a dangerous deceit." But it is equally important to remember the spirit in which that conflict should be carried on. Whatever any man—or body of men may be in the substance of their character or their conduct, they expect that those who handle the Word of Life should speak and act as in the felt presence of their attendant Lord in that serious, simple, and subdued manner which becomes men conscious of their own feebleness, their Master's power, the value of the undying soul, and the realities of an unseen but an eternal world. When the Truth is thus spoken—when it is tempered and polished into keenness by the spirit of Christian love—then the Almighty Minister recognises His own

weapon, and He sends it between the joints of the harness to the hidden man of the heart. And never, Oh! never does it return unto Him void.

This is the spirit, and this the temper in which I desire, by God's blessing, to approach the subject for our proposed discussion. To do so reasonably it is also necessary that we should thoroughly understand what it is against which we protest. On this point I cannot do better than quote for you the clear and telling words of the present Prime Minister—Mr. Disraeli—who, in his Speech on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, when answering the question, "What is Ritualism?" said:—

"I mean by Ritualism the practice by a certain portion of the Clergy of the Church of England of ceremonies, which they themselves confess are symbolical of doctrine which they are pledged by every solemn compact that can bind men to their Sovereign and their country to renounce and repudiate. And of all the false pretences of this body of men there is in my opinion none more glaring and pernicious than their pretending that they are a portion of the great High Church party of England."—*Times*, August 6th, 1874.

The title of the subject seems to me to present a certain amount of incompleteness. There is a previous question, and a very necessary one which has only to be stated to enable us to perceive its practical bearing on the general issue of the case now under review.

We have been invited—and very appropriately—to consider the past action of the Church Association, and the importance of maintaining it in its present efficiency. It is not too much to affirm that its past action has been characterised by earnestness, energy, self-sacrifice, and Christian forbearance. During a period, perhaps the most critical in the History of the Church of England, the labours of the Association have been signally blessed by the success which has attended their efforts to resist the serious encroachments of Ritualism upon the pure and Scriptural principles of the Established Church.

Very grave responsibilities—at this time especially—devolve upon all true churchmen, not merely as believers in the spiritual dispensation of the New Testament, but as conscientious supporters of the Doctrine and the Discipline of that Administration of religion which, for the last three hundred years, has become inseparably linked with our national history. There cannot be a shadow of doubt in the minds of all loyal churchmen that if the Reformation was worth achieving, it is also worth preserving.

Now, in view of that fact, the first question which suggests itself to my mind, previous to the discussion of the details of the past

action of the Church Association is, whether such action was necessary, and if so whether on church grounds it can be fully and fairly justified?

It will not require any elaborate proof to make it evident to every candid and unprejudiced mind that silence and inaction under the circumstances of imminent peril with which the Church was surrounded would have amounted not merely to a great blunder, but would have been an unpardonable weakness and a crime. Let us for a few moments review the state of things which existed at the formation of the Association, and carefully examine the position and the exigency of the Church of England at that period.

It is exactly ten years since the Association was first instituted. The object of its founders was to uphold by its instrumentality the doctrines, the principles, and the order of what was then the United Church of England and Ireland. But this was not all that was intended. There would have been, perhaps, something irregular and anomalous in any body of Churchmen uniting together for the express purpose of carrying out a line of action legitimately within the special sphere of the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of that very Church to which the members of the Association, both lay and clerical, belonged.

There was therefore something more involved in the formation of the Association than the mere maintenance of positive Truth. It was also proposed to counteract the efforts, already too successful, of certain persons professedly members of the Established Church to pervert her teaching on essential points of the Christian faith. We have the published and authoritative testimony of these very men to prove that their aim by such innovations in Doctrine and Ritual was to eliminate every trace of Protestantism from the Church of England. To do this they imposed upon themselves the unenviable and I fear I must add the un-English and unfaithful task of reviving ceremonies, superstitions, and other Papistical trash, the expulsion of which from the Church of England cost our Protestant forefathers the forfeiture of their liberty and their lives.

A leading article in the *Church Times* of March 24th, 1871—the recognised organ of the Ritualists—contains the following somewhat facetious sarcasm in reference to this subject:—

“We are contending, as our adversaries know full well, for the extirpation of Protestant opinions and practices, not merely within the Church itself, but throughout all England. . . . What we want is, not to force a Close or a McNeile into a Popish vestment, but to make Closes and McNeiles as extinct for the future as the Dodo! We do not care one solitary straw whether a man

“preaches in surplice, gown, coat, or shirt sleeves, so long as he does not preach
“any sort of Protestantism.”

This is only one specimen out of many that might be adduced in proof of a policy of aggression, not only upon the Church of England but upon every denomination of religion throughout the land. There can be no mistake here. The language is plain, and the object perfectly intelligible. The overt declaration of such unscrupulous propagandism thus deliberately paraded in face of the whole nation rendered the existence of some society like the Church Association not merely a necessity, but a duty.

But, notwithstanding this necessity it may be asked, did not the Church Association by its proposed plan of action undertake responsibilities and duties which rightly belong to the Bishops and Archbishops; and in so far therefore has not the Association entered upon a line of labour which had already been preoccupied by our ecclesiastical rulers?

I notice this objection because it has been made over and over and once again by persons who it is to be feared feel a far deeper interest in the failure of the Society, than any real respect for, or true and loyal obedience to, the chief pastors of the Church.

It is well here to remind all such objectors of the all important fact that the Church Association was not called into existence until after the deliberate and reiterated assurances on the part of the Bishops that they were wholly unable to cope with the magnitude of the evil presented by the Ritualistic innovations. The case for the Association may be thus stated. Aggrieved parishioners appealed to the Bishops. They called upon their Lordships to restrain the innovators. The Bishops in the first instance tried moral persuasion, but it was treated by the Ritualists as an exhibition of Episcopal feebleness to cover the want of power. Some of their Lordships proceeded a step further. They publicly denounced these novelties as utterly alien to the teaching and spirit of the Reformed Church. But it produced no effect beyond that of subjecting the Bishops to uncourteous criticism on the part of the Ritualists. Meanwhile the policy of the innovators remained not only unchecked, but was every day acquiring strength and volume from new accessions of converts from the ranks of the insufficiently or inaccurately informed, till at length it assumed threatening and formidable dimensions.

Gentle measures proving ineffectual the Bishops were requested to put the law in force. But here new difficulties arose. Their

Lordships very justly and naturally objected to this course on two grounds.

Firstly. That Ecclesiastical law was so vague and indefinite that it was by no means certain that conviction would follow prosecution.

Secondly. Even if the legal issue were not doubtful the desired success would involve the Bishops in extravagant if not ruinous law expenses.

These objections were felt to be just and reasonable. It was unfair and manifestly absurd to blame the Bishops; and yet on the other hand it was impossible to allow the revival of mediæval Popery in the Church of England.

It was at this juncture that the Bishops said—let us have the law defined, and when we know what it is we shall be ready to enforce it against the innovators. Under these circumstances the Church Association took action in the matter. In their earnest desire to relieve the Bishops of the expense—and I think I am warranted to add—the odium of legal prosecutions, the Church Association during the ten years of its existence has expended upwards of £30,000 in having the true sense of the law rightly interpreted and defined.

Six suits have been tried, and in every instance the Courts decided in favour of the Church Association, thereby justifying their appeal to the legal tribunals.

The country at large—the Church of England—and the Right Reverend Prelates owe the Association a lasting debt of gratitude, though it is to be feared there is some difference of opinion on this point, judging from the hard names, and the shallow and injurious imputations sometimes cast upon the Society by some of the very persons whom in an especial manner it was intended to benefit—imputations as unworthy of those who make use of them as they are undeserved by those who amid evil report and good report have been struggling to maintain the national religion in the simplicity and purity of its native light.

When discussing the past action of the Association, there is another and a very important fact worthy of special notice. For six years previous to the formation of the Church Association there was another Society in existence called the English Church Union. The avowed object of this institution was not only to advocate and uphold the Ritualists in their illegal practices and their insubordination to the Bishops, but to promote the spread of those very ceremonies and practices which the highest Court of Judicature has condemned. They went further in their defiance of the Bishops. They undertook

to provide funds to enable the clerical mutineers to maintain their hostile attitude in resisting the law, and treating with contempt the judgments of the law courts. Nothing but the most unimpeachable testimony could justify me in making these assertions. Accordingly I turn to the Report of the English Church Union for the year 1866-7. There I find the following declaration of open war against Episcopal authority, and an expression of the most sincere sympathy with the innovating recusants.

The words of the Report are as follows :—

“Of another class of cases, two may be submitted by way of illustration—one being that of a clergyman in Norfolk, who incurred the displeasure of his Bishop. The President and Council, acting under the advice of the Honorary Proctor, recommended that the choral service, and other matters objected to by the Diocesan, should not be discontinued; and offered to defend the priest, if legal proceedings were taken against him.”—*English Church Union Monthly Circular*, 1867, p. 194.

There is nothing very surprising in the result which the Report announces with regard to this case, if we bear in mind what has been already stated as to the almost prohibitory tariff imposed upon the Bishops in the matter of legal prosecutions. The Report adds :—

“They—[the President and Council]—are happy to be able to report that the Bishop did not institute proceedings; and they were, therefore, not called upon for material assistance.”—*Ibid.* p. 194.

Of course not. How could it be otherwise? Here was a Bishop set at utter defiance by a professedly Church Society, purporting to consist of English gentlemen, whom one would naturally be disposed to credit with a belief in the duty of courteous submission to their “Spiritual Pastors and Masters.” This body of English Churchmen represented rank, influence, and money. And with all the historic traditions of English chivalry and loyalty, and the conservative precepts of Apostolic Christianity, these gentlemen did not consider it derogatory to their position to announce that “No Bishop will be permitted to attempt to restrain any practices which found favour with the President and Council, without being opposed by the whole force of the Union, backed by funds derived from its 5000 subscribers.” What chance then had a Bishop,—single-handed against such a formidable combination? It would have been impossible under such circumstances for any Bishop to institute legal proceedings against a Ritualist, without unjustifiably cramping his private resources. In reference to this subject I am glad to be enabled to avail myself of the testimony of the Lord Bishop of London in his recent charge to the clergy of his diocese. His Lordship says :—

"In cases of immorality, indeed, a public-spirited layman occasionally, but more usually the Bishop, has felt bound to institute proceedings, and has removed the scandal, if removed, at the cost sometimes of one half of his Episcopal income. Such cases, however, are happily rare; and a Bishop must be prepared to submit to such hardship,—for hardship it is,—now and then in the course of his episcopate. But he is not obliged, and cannot be expected, to incur similar costs,—to cripple his usefulness, alter his social status, and impoverish his family,—whenever any clergyman in his diocese is delated for a breach of a rubric, or the introduction of unauthorised ritual."—*Bishop of London's Charge*, 1875, p. 58.

As to the utter powerlessness of the authority of a Bishop even in his own Court the following salient fact is certified by his Lordship. "The Bishops' authority in their Courts no less than in their character as ordinaries has proved practically inefficient to check or regulate the illegal or obnoxious alterations in ritual of which complaints have been made to them."

In corroboration of this view of the all but insuperable difficulties which lay in the path of our Ecclesiastical rulers, in the matter of legal redress against the party of innovation, we have the equally recent and candid admission of the Lord Bishop of Peterborough. His Lordship says, "Before now"—that is previous to the introduction of the Public Worship Regulation Act—"a clergyman could do as he thought proper, and there was no power to compel his obedience. The result was that the Church was fast passing away from the paralysed hands of her legitimate rulers." Now it is universally admitted, and indeed plainly stated by the *Quarterly Review*, that it was owing to the Church Association that this Bill became the law of the land. Therefore we are warranted to state that the past action of the Church Association has by the Divine aid materially contributed to save the Church of England from the danger which at one time seemed all but irremediable!

Under these circumstances it is impossible to resist the evidence which glares upon us, from all the facts which come to us both from friends and foes, that if it had not been for the timely intervention of the Church Association the Established Church would have been, at the present time, plunged into hopeless and inextricable confusion. And I cannot help adding that instead of being subjected to unjust and ungenerous criticism from any of the faithful adherents of the Church of England, this Association deserves the warmest thanks and the cordial sympathy and support of all who value the inestimable blessings of an open Bible and a Scriptural Church.

But, "the hardest and the unkindest cut of all," was that inflicted upon the Association when it was placed by some of our

Bishops in the same scale with the English Church Union — a Society which endorses the illegal acts of the Ritualists—throws discredit upon the Articles of our Faith—and by every means at its disposal encourages disloyalty to the Church of England, and insubordination to her constituted authorities.

The time, however, will come when the Church Association will have ample justice done to it as the loyal and Scriptural supporter of the privileges of the Church of England, and as its true and uncompromising defender when its citadel had been seized by conspirators within its walls, and were aided and abetted by interested accomplices both within and without its pale. In proof of the existence of treachery in our camp, the following extract will be enough :

“ Our place (says a Ritualistic writer) is appointed us among Protestants, and in “ a community deeply tainted in its practical system by Protestant heresy ; but our “ duty is the expulsion of the evil and not flight from it.”—*Church and the World*. Ed. 1866, p. 237.

That these were not idle words of mere threat or boasting, but a candid avowal of the work of demolition of the Church already too successfully begun, will be evident from the words of a Roman Catholic Archbishop — now Cardinal Manning. In the *Weekly Register*, September 29th, 1866, we find him thus alluding to the Ritualists.

“ The clergy of the Established Church (said the Romish Archbishop) have “ taken out of the hands of the Catholic clergy the labour of contending for the “ doctrine of *Transubstantiation* and *Invocation of Saints*. The Catholics have “ been left the much more happy and peaceful task of reaping the fields ; and I “ confess I would much rather be a humble reaper, or a simple gleaner, than be “ armed with the weapons of controversy.”

In the same year the Primate of all England, in his reply to an address from the English Church Union, bore witness to the mischief such Ritualism was inflicting upon the Church of England in the following words :

“ I cannot but feel (said the Archbishop) that those who have violated a com- “ promise and settlement which has existed for 300 years, and are introducing vest- “ ments and ceremonies of very doubtful legality, are really, though I am sure “ quite unconsciously, doing the work of the worst enemies of the Church.”—*English Church Union Monthly Circular*, 1866, p. 73.

His Grace employed, as became his high office, the language of charity ; but the published utterances of the party of innovation leaves no room for doubt that, so far from being unconscious of the mischief they were inflicting upon the Church to which they so solemnly swore true allegiance, that they were even “glorying in their shame,” by ostentatiously denouncing, in the most offensive

and extravagant language, the doctrines of the Reformation and the Reformers themselves.

In a volume of *Essays on the Reunion of Christendom*, edited by the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L., with an *Introductory Essay* by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., (*Hayes*, 1868,) the following passage occurs on page 180 :—

“The marvel is, that Roman Catholics whatever their views may be, do not see the wisdom of *aiding us* to the utmost. Admitting that *we are but a lay body with no pretensions to the name of a Church*, we yet, in our belief (however mistaken) that we are one, are doing for England what they cannot do. *We are teaching men to believe that God is to be worshipped under the form of Bread, and they are learning the lesson from us which they have refused to learn from the Roman teachers that have been among us for the last three hundred years.* We are teaching men to endure willingly the pain of confession, which is an intense trial to the reserved Anglo-Saxon nature, and to believe that a man’s ‘I absolve thee,’ is the voice of God. How many English Protestants have Roman priests brought to Confession, compared with the Anglican clergy? Could they have overcome the English dislike to ‘mummery’ as we are overcoming it? *On any hypothesis we are doing their work.*”

To counteract this work the Church Association printed and circulated upwards of one million and a half of publications written in a popular style, in order effectually to meet the wants of the people and to impart reliable and useful information upon the doctrines of the Church of England and the New Testament. If the Society did nothing else but disseminate through the land plain and practical tracts bearing on the truths of Christianity as represented by the teaching of the Church of England, it did a noble work, for which it deserves the best thanks of all who are really interested in the welfare of the Church of England.

The decided action it took in denouncing the practice of Auricular Confession forms also a very essential feature in its past action. In every part of the country, in the metropolis and in the provinces, meetings were organized and lectures delivered in which the unscriptural character of this essentially Romish practice was exposed.

I must also notice the energetic movement and the well arranged organization of the Church Association with regard to the Vestment question and the Eastward position. It was no small effort to have a petition presented against legalizing these unauthorized usages, signed by no less than 150,000 members of the Church of England.

In short, to have the law defined and brought to bear upon illegal practices and ceremonies, to circulate sound and scriptural information among the people, to direct the attention of Parliament and the

press to Ritualistic innovations—to organize lectures and meetings throughout the country, to protest against the introduction of Sacramental Auricular Confession—these, and such like efforts, constitute, in the main, the past action of the Society, and I think no one who rightly understands the signs of the times will hesitate to admit that it is the duty of all good Churchmen to give their support, their sympathy, and their prayers for the maintenance of the past action of the Association in increased efficiency in the future.

But I cannot conclude this paper without alluding briefly to the past action of the Association in the matter of legal prosecutions.

LEGAL PROSECUTIONS.

On two points the Association has been subjected to unfair and disingenuous criticism. The Ritualists find fault with the Church Association for legal proceedings. We are called “a limited liability persecuting Company”—and yet strange to say it was the Ritualists who long ago set the example of appealing to the Law Courts. Who got up the case against Mr. Gorham? Who prosecuted the Essayists and Reviewers? The late Bishops of Exeter and Salisbury were not members of the Church Association, and no one could say their Lordships had any sympathy in that direction. It was not the Church Association which brought the case of *Westerton v. Liddell* before the legal tribunals—nor did they urge Mr. Poole of St. Barnabas to appeal to the Privy Council.

The fact is that in all these cases legal proceedings were resorted to as a matter of constitutional privilege, and no one of the Evangelical party spoke about persecution and intolerance; but now that the Church Association have recourse to the same line of proceeding they are branded with the imputation of “being essentially intolerant and persecuting.” That is very unfair and very inconsistent. Before the Association was established a number of illegal ceremonies and practices were introduced into the Church of England, and those who did these things not only maintained that they were legal, but that those who did not adopt them were not consistent churchmen. By the aid of the Church Association the law was made known, and having thus determined who were and who were not acting up to the letter and spirit of the Church’s teaching the Association desired to leave it entirely in the hands of the chief pastors of the Church to put that law in force. And this is called persecution. Most men would call it justice.

I cannot better express the true definition of persecution than in

the words of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, in an address delivered at the Diocesan Conference held at Wells on the 12th of last month, (October).

His Lordship said—

“Persecution is, indeed, a vile and odious thing, equally unworthy of a free State, or of a pure Church : but to bring in the aid of the law to prevent an authorised expounder of the Church’s doctrine, one invested with power to speak in the Church’s name, from using that power for the overthrowing of the Church’s doctrine, this surely is not persecution, but justice in her simplest form. No community, however free from State control, can allow its ministers to give the lie to its own doctrines which they are employed to propagate: much less can a National Church, endowed with large revenues, and set in place of power and dignity, allow those who share in these advantages to contradict her teaching, and act in opposition to her laws. The firm repression of all such acts is not persecution, but a vindication of truth and law, without which no community can exist.”

Times, 14 October, 1875.

That which lies at the root of all the past and prospective actions of the Association is an earnest desire on the part of those who support its principles that the Scriptural purity and spiritual character of the Church of England should be maintained in their integrity. The whole force of the operations of the Society are intended to give the utmost prominence to the positive teaching of the New Testament, and especially of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Sacerdotalism is incompatible with Christianity. The Church of England knows nothing about sacramental confession, priestly absolution, or the real objective presence in the Holy Communion. It teaches us as clearly as the good old Saxon of our Prayer Book can convey it to us that “our Heavenly Father did of His tender mercy give His only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption. And that He made there by His one oblation of Himself once offered a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.”

Now hear how some of the Ritualists encourage the public devotion of the people towards our Crucified Redeemer.

The text on which the following extract was founded was that in the book of Genesis, where God said to Noah, “Make thee an ark of wood.” (Gen. vi. 14.) And here is the commentary of the preacher upon these words.

“Make thee an ark of wood,” literally if thou wilt. “Go to some clever workman, tell him to make a cross of ebony, and fasten thereon a crucified figure of ivory. Tell him to represent the drops

"of blood with rubies, and the tears with pearls, and the nails and the crown of thorns with iron and with brass. Hang it up in that corner of thy chamber where thou sayest thy prayers, nay, build and prepare an oratory to contain so precious a symbol, and if I know anything of your heart and mine, thy devotion will be assisted when thou kneelest there. But withal make thee an ark of the wood of the true Cross. S. Helen, your patron Saint, it was, who found it; like her, gain a deeper love and devotion to the Crucified!" —*"The Story of Noah's Ark."* Sermons for Lent and Easter preached in S. Helen's Church, Tarporeley, by the Rev. A. F. Tollemache, M.A., p. 11, 12.

And this unscriptural worship of God by the mediation of images and corporeal resemblances was publicly and, so far as I know, with impunity, preached in a pulpit of the Church of England by a clergyman who solemnly assented and consented to the Book of Common Prayer, which enforces the Ten Commandments, and the Homily, which so plainly warns us against the peril of idolatry.

As long as such practices and doctrines are publicly advocated, so long it is necessary that the Church Association should carry on its missionary efforts among the people, and infuse amongst them sound Gospel teaching, as the only effectual antidote against such popish errors.

I would now ask, does the need for such an Association still exist? I do not believe that any true churchman could possibly give any answer but in the affirmative.

And here I would desire to define what the Church Association is and what it is not. The Church Association is simply a Society of Churchmen united on the principles of the Reformation, and are devotedly attached to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.

It is *not* the unity of party in the bond of selfishness—nor of fanaticism in the bond of persecution—nor of bigotry in the bond of hatred. No. It is the unity of Christian men bound together and to their Great Master for the protection of the true profession of the Gospel, in the spirit and in the bond of peace.

It is no clique or coterie of any one section of the Church of England engaged in improper rivalry with another section.

It is an Association of men, both lay and clerical, who are acutely jealous for the honour of Christ's Holy Name—for His all-sufficient sacrifice for ever perfected upon the Cross—for the unchangeable and intransmissible prerogatives of His all prevailing

priesthood ; and for the success of His kingdom in the hearts and consciences of His people.

It is not an attempt of one party to crush another party. It is no conflict of opinion between the High Church and Low Church, but a solemn protest against erroneous and false doctrine alien to the New Testament, and inconsistent with loyal attachment to the Church of England.

The Church Association was not established with the paltry and contemptible motive of serving party purposes. We desire every reasonable and lawful latitude for all parties within the Church. But the Ritualists cannot be called a Church of England party. They are a foreign importation. Their ecclesiastical prepossessions direct their thoughts to Rome, whose Church they so faithfully imitate that even Romish dignitaries have become jealously alarmed at the too close resemblance. We desire to see perfect freedom to every creed and religious denomination with the one solitary condition, that they yield true and faithful obedience to the law. This exceptional provision has been persistently and defiantly rejected by the Ritualists. They despise their Bishops, and they openly violate the law. And though we may give them credit for great activity and zeal they cannot expect to be regarded as loyal and true to the Church they are doing all they can to break in pieces.

The position taken up by the Church Association is not that of party against party—but of Protestantism against Popery—of Evangelicalism against Sacerdotalism—of the simple Gospel of the grace of God against its counterfeits and corruptions under the fascinating but insidious guise of an old heresy under a new face.

In the days of old, under pagan darkness, the pages of classical literature sparkle with instances of devoted patriotism. We read of one whose daring, devotedness, and self-denial are worthy of a noble name and cause. To strike terror into the heart of the royal invader of his country he procured an interview, and, while speaking to the king, he plunged his right hand into the fire burning before him, and holding it there apparently without any sense of pain, he repeated these words: "Behold in what little esteem the body is to those who have great glory in view."

One such man struck awe into the heart of his country's foes. That act of self-sacrifice could at best affect only the temporal welfare of an earthly kingdom. And can it be that in England, under Christian enlightenment, there cannot be found men enough to exhibit the moral courage "to count all things but loss" for the excel-

lency of the Master's cause—for preserving the truth of God intact—and for securing those rights and privileges bequeathed to them by their illustrious ancestors after many a bloody and hard-fought battle-field?

It may be that those who take a prominent part in the mission of the Church Association are not thereby advancing their temporal interests in the eyes of those who have power to promote them to posts of dignity and emolument in the Church. But what of that? Shall a pagan with no higher aim than the stability of an earthly dynasty literally part with his right hand to preserve his native soil from the tread of the invader, and shall men who have been purchased in body, soul, and spirit by the blood of the adorable Redeemer be so faint-hearted as to dread the displeasure of any power on earth when the Ark of God is in danger of being taken?

By all means let the timid and half-hearted remain “at home with the stuff,” but let those who “behold the greater glory,” and desire to see the spread of the pure Gospel in this realm of England, “play the men for their people, and for the cities of their God.”



No. XLIX.



THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IS PROTESTANT.

HISTORICAL TESTIMONY

TO THE

PROTESTANTISM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

FROM HER

Articles, Formularies, Constitution, High Church Authorities

AND

CONVOCATION.

PRICE TWOPENCE.



CONTENTS.

THE word "Catholic"—Authorized interpretation of the word according to the Church of England—since 1559 by Convocation to the present time—Explanation in the Lesser Catechism of Edward VI.—Dean Nowell's Catechism—a Recognized Standard of the Church of England—revised and sanctioned by Convocation in 1562—Dean Aldrich's testimony to it—similar explanation of word "Catholic" in it—The Homilies—What is a "true Church?"—Romish Church "*not* a true Church"—The word "Protestant"—origin and explanation of it—the two cardinal characteristics of Protestantism—limit of its application.

The Church of England Protestant in *Fact*—in History—in Constitution—Legal Definition and Status—in Doctrines and Ecclesiastical Relations.

Specific Protests in the Articles against Romish errors—Earlier Formularies—instances of their Protestantism—Oath of Abjuration of Romish error and jurisdiction in the Prayer-books of Edward VI. and Elizabeth—Oath framed by Convocation in 1640—Oath formerly at matriculation in Oxford—Service for Nov. 5.

The Church of England "Protestant" in her Legal Definition and Status—Coronation Oath for two centuries *according to Statute*—Act of Union with Scotland—Act of Union with Ireland—What is the Church?—*Ritualistic* testimony to the Protestantism of the Church and Nation.

Ecclesiastical Relations—Intercourse between the early Reformers at Home and Abroad—Influence of Calvin, Peter Martyr, and others in our Reformation—Calvin and Cranmer—Calvin and Parker—Propositions for unity among all Protestants—why Calvin's earlier overtures failed—Protestant Synod at Frankfort, 1577, to settle common confession and discipline—Elizabeth's support and assistance—why inconclusive—Authorized use of works of Foreign Protestant Divines in the English Church—Foreign Protestant Ministers admitted to English Church preferments and Benefices without Episcopal ordination—Sympathy and Protection accorded to foreign Protestant Churches settled in London and Canterbury—Synod of Dort, 1618, convened by all Protestant churches—English Church Divines sent over to assist—use afterwards made of this fact by Charles I.—Use of the title Protestant by Caroline writers—Heylin—The period of the Restoration—Declaration from Breda—Character, conduct and policy of CHARLES II.—Vigilant attitude of the nation on behalf of Protestantism—Protestant safeguards—Test Act—Test of Abhorrence (1675)—Exclusion Bill—Infatuation and Popish measures of JAS. II.—Memorial from the CHURCH OF ENGLAND to the Prince of Orange—Revolution of 1688—Remarkable letter from SANCROFT.

Testimony to the Protestantism of the Church of England from chief men of the High Church party—Laud on his trial—on the scaffold—solemn Protestation of King Charles "the Martyr"—Atterbury on his defence.

Protestation of the Caroline Bishops under Laud's primacy—Convocation—circumstances connected with the Convocation of 1689—Convocation of 1701-1713-14—1717—Address from the Convocation and the Lords.

General consideration of this challenge to Protestantism—Omission of the word Protestant from the formularies unimportant—omission of the word ALTAR *most* important for Ritualistic "Catholicism"—consideration of the claim of Ritualists to be "*Catholics*" in their own sense of the word—Conclusion—Note. On the Savoy Conference and Revision of the Prayer Book, 1662.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IS PROTESTANT.

HISTORICAL TESTIMONY

TO THE

PROTESTANTISM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

FROM HER

*ARTICLES, FORMULARIES, CONSTITUTION, HIGH
CHURCH AUTHORITIES AND CONVOCATION.*

OF all the daring attempts to falsify history and fact, and to insult common sense, none is more astounding than the effort to advance the growth of Romanizing principles by the baseless assertion industriously propagated, that the Church of England is *not Protestant*. Imbued with principles to which *Protestantism* is a standing reproach, the advocates of this untenable proposition loudly vaunt their *Catholicity*. Their claim is amusing if tested by the sense *they have chosen* to assign to it—a sense unauthorized by the Church of England. For in the use of the word *Catholic* in her formularies she defines her meaning beyond all question of ambiguity: Thus:

“Ye shall pray for Christ’s Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world.”—(Canon 55, 1662.)

Again,

“We are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son, *which is the blessed Company of all faithful people*.”—(Communion Service.)

This interpretation of the word “*Catholic*” has been promulgated authoritatively and continuously by the Church of England from almost the earliest period of her Reformation (1559) to the present time.

In the Catechism put forth by authority in the reign of Edward VI., with the Articles attached to it, agreed upon in the Convocation of 1552, we have the following explanation:

“*Master*. Well, thou hast now said sufficiently of the Holy Ghost. But this would I hear of thee:—why it immediately followeth that we believe the *Holy Universal Church* and the Communion of Saints?”

"*Scholar.* Therefore this calling together of the faithful is called *universal* (Catholic), because it is bound to no one special place, for God throughout all coasts of the world hath them that worship him; which, though they be far scattered asunder by divers distance of countries and dominions, yet are they members most nearly joined of that same body whereof Christ is the Head; and have one spirit, faith, sacraments, prayers, forgiveness of sins, and heavenly bliss common among them all; and be so knit with the bond of love that they endeavour themselves in nothing more than each to help other, and to build together in Christ."

Precisely the same exposition is given in DEAN NOWELL's Catechism, promulgated after careful revision by Convocation, with its sanction in 1572.

"It was by them (the Upper and Lower House) unanimously approved and allowed as their own book and owned doctrine."—(*Strype, Annals*, I. i. 522.)

This Catechism, DEAN ALDRICH refers to in his Reply to Woodhead's two Discourses concerning Adoration in the Holy Eucharist, Oxford, 1687, as follows:—

"When the sense of the Church of England was the question, one would have expected to hear what the Church Catechism says? what the Homilies? what NOWELL's Catechism? Books allowed and published by the Church's authority and authentic witnesses of Her judgment."—p. 11.

"The Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of *Real Presence* in all the books that are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church's nor NOWELL's Catechisms. For, although it be once in the Liturgy and once in the Articles, it is mentioned in both places as a phrase of the Papists and rejected for their abuse of it."—p. 15.

We quote from NOWELL's Catechism (Jacobson's Edition), on the Catholic Church, thus;

"*Magister.* Quorsum tandem Ecclesiam hanc Catholicam nominas?"

"*Auditor.* Perinde ac si universalem dicerem. Non est enim hic cœtus, conciliumque piorum, certo quopiam uno loco aut tempore adstrictum, sed fidelium qui ab orbe condito omnibus locis atque sæculis vixerunt, victurique sunt, universitatem continet atque complectitur" "ad hanc Rempublicam proprie pertinent quotquot vere timent, honorant et invocant Deum, prorsus applicantes animos ad sancte pieque vivendum, quique fiduciam atque spem omnem in Deo constituent, vitæ eternæ beatitudinem certe expectant."

"Nam quum Deus per universas terrarum regiones atque oras ut et per omnes ætates atque sæcula habeat qui se pure cæsteque venerentur, hi omnes, licet diversis et loginquis temporibus atque locis separati sint atque distracti, ubicunque gentium, ubicunque terrarum fuerint, unius tamen sunt ejusdem corporis cujus caput est Christus, membra inter se quam maxime connexa atque cohærentia:" AND MUCH MORE TO THE SAME EFFECT.

"*Master.* To what purpose then dost thou style this Church '*Catholic*'?"

"*Hearer.* It is just the same as if I were to call it *universal*. For this assembly and council of pious men is not confined to any one special place, nor is it restricted by time, but comprehends and embraces the universal gathering of the

faithful who have existed from the foundation of the world, and shall exist in every place and age. To this commonwealth properly belong as many as truly fear, honour, and call upon God in sincerity, earnestly endeavouring to live holily and piously, and who, reposing all their faith and hope in God, confidently await the happiness of eternal life.

"For since God throughout all regions and coasts of the world as well as in all ages and dispensations hath those who worship Him in purity and chastity, all these, though separated and scattered asunder by divers distances of time and place, wherever in the world, of whatever race they may be, yet are they members most nearly joined of that same body whereof Christ is the Head."

Then to prevent any mistake arising from ambiguity precise definitions are given at the close :

"*Ecclesia Catholica. Latine universa congregatio—universitas piorum hominum—Respublica Christiana, vel Christianorum.*"

De. Catholic Church.—"Universal congregation: The whole body of pious men: Christian commonwealth or commonwealth of Christians."

This, be it remembered, as we have already shewn, had the unanimous approval of Convocation as "their own book and owned doctrine." Has it ever been disowned?

Of all the documents which authoritatively declare the mind of the Church of England, none more convincingly attest the truth of the position that She is "*Protestant in fact*" than the HOMILIES.* They unmercifully deal with the corruptions of Rome, and of Modern Ritualism, and their perusal will amply repay the reader. To quote one reference only on this subject and the one with which it is connected.

In the second part of the Homily for Whitsunday, (p. 495, Edn. Soc. Prom. Chr. Knowledge), we have a definition of the true Church.

"The true Church is an *universal* congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner stone."

And then the Homily proceeds to show that "the Church of Rome is so far wide from the nature of such a true Church that *nothing can be more*;" giving several characteristic reasons, among them the fact:—

"That Christ commended to his Church a *Sacrament* of his Body and Blood, they (the Romanists) have changed it into a *sacrifice* for the quick and dead."

* The HOMILIES as well as the ARTICLES it must be remembered are at *present* standards of the doctrine of the Church of England. "The Second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and therefore we judge them to be read in the Churches diligently and distinctly that they may be understood of the people."—(Art. xxxv.) Therefore any doctrine at variance with that set forth in the Homilies, though preached in the pulpits of the Church of England—even by a Bishop—is not in the judgment of the Church "godly" or "wholesome."

With respect to the word "*Protestant*" there is a strange misconception of its meaning, if not intentional misapplication in its use. It is regarded by those who reject it, as contradictory to *Catholic*, which it is not. Though chiefly a negative term, the appellation is not entirely so. Whilst it prominently asserts what a man is *not* in belief, it has a positive side, and a limit of application. Its opposite is, not *Catholic*, but *Romanist* or *Papist*.

The historical circumstances of its origin are well known. Like most epithets which arise from political or polemical strife, it was at first a term of reproach. Party names are usually not complimentary. But in spite of this, they become badges of which men are proud, and the word *Protestant*, like *Christian*, proves no exception to the rule. More properly belonging to the Augustan Confession, it rapidly spread to the other Reformed Churches of the West. Differing among themselves in some doctrinal matters and in sacramental views, they were bonded by their opposition to the errors, superstitions, and claims of Rome. They agreed in *two fundamental principles* which Rome anathematizes—these are the characteristics of *Protestantism*:—The sufficiency of *Holy Scripture for Salvation*, and the grand doctrine of *Justification by Faith*.

It is therefore utterly beside both truth and reason to quarrel with the term on the false supposition that it is applicable to Socinians, Arians, Deists, and others. The ground which embraces the Church of England was covered long before the rise of modern sects; and amongst the Churches of the Reformation, the Church of England stands pre-eminent in hoisting the banner of Protestantism. *Protestant* she is, and *must* be, until she erases from her Confession the sixth and eleventh Articles. More than this. She is *Protestant in fact*, and *always has been* since her emancipation from the fetters of Rome. Protestant in her History, in her Constitution, in her Legal definition and Status, in her Doctrines, and in her Ecclesiastical relations.

In her Articles of Faith she not only declares "The Church of Rome has erred," (Art. xix.) but protests in strong and explicit terms against specific errors:—Works of Supererogation (Art. xiv.); the Infallibility of General Councils (Art. xxi.); Purgatory (Art. xxii.); Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Saints (Art. xxii.); the use of an unknown tongue in Public Worship (Art. xxiv.); Seven Sacraments (Art. xxv.); Gazing upon, Carrying about, Lifting up, Worshipping and Reserving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (Arts. xxv. xxviii.); Transubstantiation and Masses (Arts. xxviii. xxxi.); the denial of the cup to the laity (Art. xxx.); and Celibacy of the Clergy (Art. xxxii.). Whilst thus *Protestant* in her Articles of Faith, she was emphatically so in the formularies of her earlier days long before the title was indubitably stamped upon her by the Statute Book.

In the first and second Prayer Books of Edward VI., the Litany contained the following petition:—

"From all sedition and privy conspiracy, from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, from all false doctrine and heresy, from

hardness of heart and contempt of Thy word and commandment, Good Lord, deliver us."

The Sects which abound in these days had no existence then; the juxtaposition therefore of the words "*all false doctrine and heresy*," and their relation to the preceding, will show to what they refer.

The oath administered to Bishops, Priests and Deacons is the same in the two Prayer Books of Edward and that of Elizabeth, and commences thus :*—

"I from henceforth shall utterly *renounce, refuse, relinquish, and forsake* the Bishop of Rome, and his authority, power, and jurisdiction, and I shall never consent nor agree that the Bishop of Rome shall practise, exercise, or have any manner of authority, jurisdiction, or power within this realm, or any other the king's dominions, but shall resist the same at all times, to the uttermost of my power," &c. &c.

Until the recent abolition of tests, many graduates may remember taking a similar oath at their matriculation in the University of Oxford.

Various Liturgical services in Elizabeth's reign, *prescribed by authority*, are replete with prayers against Romish error, craft, tyranny, persecution, and oppression, and on behalf of the persecuted Protestants abroad. A list of these services and prayers is given at the close of the volume published by the Parker Society. (Liturg. Services, Q. Elizabeth.) One specimen will suffice. An Order for prayer and thanksgiving was "set forth by authority in 1594 and again in 1598." We cull the following from the "Prefatory Admonition to the Reader :"—

"Which mischievous devices as they have all flowed from none other fountain than from the city of seven hills, the See of Rome, and the seat of the Beast, not in regard of any desert of ours, but because we have abandoned the cup of spiritual abomination wherewith these have long intoxicated the kings of the earth. So have they been continually projected, carried forward, and managed by idolatrous priests and Jesuits, his creatures, the very locusts, that crawl out of the bottomless pit. Howbeit they have been and are mightily seconded by certain Potentates of the earth, who do nothing else, but serve themselves of that *idolatrous Romish religion* . . . they likewise have been blown up by that brood of *Massing priests*," &c.

* In 1640 the oath framed by Laud and the Convocation was as follows :—

"I, A. B. do swear that I do approve the Doctrine and Discipline or Government established in the Church of England as containing all things necessary to salvation : and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other directly or indirectly to bring in any Popish doctrine contrary to that which is established : nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by Archbishops, Bishops, &c., nor yet ever subject it to the usurpations and *superstitions* of the See of Rome. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same, without any equivocation or mental evasion or secret reservation whatsoever. And this I do heartily, willingly and truly upon the faith of a Christian. So help me God in Jesus Christ."—*Rushworth*, vol. iii. p. 1186.

Then in one of the prayers thus offered up by the Church of England, we have the petition:—

“Good Lord, strike a sense of this thy powerful mercy into our hearts from thence to fetch a sorrowful sighing for our sins—an earnest desire of amendment and most unfeigned thanks to our gracious Preserver. But those priests of Baal, the hellish chaplains of *Antichrist*, accursed runagates from their God and Prince . . . confound them in thy wrath. But let our gracious Queen still reign and rule in spite of Rome and Rheims (a seminary of English Papists abroad) and Spain and Hell.” (*Liturgical Services. Q. Eliz. Parker Society.*)

Let not the reader suppose that these strong expressions are peculiar to a bygone age. He may find them matched by others equally forcible in a Service bound up with our present Prayer Book, —“A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to be used yearly upon the Fifth day of November,” to commemorate two great historical events, —“the happy deliverance of King JAMES THE FIRST and the three Estates of England from the most traitorous and bloody-intended massacre by gunpowder. And also for the happy arrival of *King WILLIAM* on this day for the deliverance of our *Church* and nation.” In it we find:—

“We yield Thee our unfeigned thanks and praise for the wonderful and mighty deliverance of our Gracious Sovereign, King JAMES THE FIRST, the Queen, the Prince, and all the Royal Family, with the Nobility, *Clergy*, and Commons of England then assembled in Parliament, by *Popish treachery* appointed as sheep to the slaughter in a most barbarous and savage manner, beyond the examples of former ages.”

So also:—

“Accept also, most gracious God, of our unfeigned thanks for . . . putting a new song into our mouths by bringing His Majesty, King WILLIAM, upon this day for the deliverance of our *Church* and nation from *Popish tyranny* and arbitrary power.”

And once more:—

“O God, whose name is excellent in all the earth, . . . who on this day didst miraculously preserve our *Church* and State from the *secret contrivance* and *hellish malice* of *Popish conspirators*, and on this day didst begin to give us a mighty deliverance from the open tyranny and oppression of the same cruel and blood-thirsty enemies. We bless Thee . . . for this Thy late marvellous loving-kindness to our *Church* and nation in the preservation of our Religion and Liberties.”

With such statements before our eyes we are bewildered to think how any one can imagine, much less assert, that our Formularies bear no testimony to the Protestantism of the Church of England.

Such a survey of her Articles and Liturgies will satisfy the most critical that the *Protestantism* of the Church of England is a most undoubted fact.

In addition to this there are matters of *historic* interest we can only allude to in passing, such as “*Jewell’s Challenge*” and “*Jewell’s Apology*,” the controversies with Rome which grew out of them,

and similar vindications of the doctrines of the Church of England against the corruptions of Rome.*

The Constitution of this realm is *Protestant*, and it could not be *Protestant* unless the *National Church* were Protestant also. As all know, the Act of Settlement makes it an indispensable condition that whoever mounts the throne shall be a Protestant. At the Coronation, in one of the grandest cathedral edifices of the country, the Archbishop of Canterbury, representing the Church, exacts an oath from the Sovereign, one of the articles of which is as follows :

“Will you to the utmost of your powers maintain the laws of God, the true principles of the Gospel, and the *Protestant Reformed Religion* established by law?”

Such is the oath which now for nearly two centuries has in accordance with the terms of the statute been administered to and taken by every King and Queen who has succeeded to the Imperial Crown of this realm at their respective coronations by one of the Archbishops or Bishops of this realm of England.

It is one of the fundamental conditions of the union of the Church and State, and the title of the Establishment *rests* upon it, that the Crown should swear to maintain *not* the Anglican—*not* the Anglo-Catholic—*not* the Catholic—but the *Protestant Reformed Religion* established by law.

Thus the Establishment is by law, and the Constitution—*Protestant*. But,—the Church of England is the Establishment,—we leave the reader to draw the inference! When the union with Scotland was being negotiated, 1705-7, the Presbyterians were naturally anxious lest their cherished religious institutions should be placed in jeopardy by an Episcopalian majority in England. They therefore stipulated—and the great men who conducted that transaction without difficulty conceded—that there should be a solemn and independent guarantee for the security of the Church Establishment in Scotland. This was carried out (5 Anne, cap. 8, Art. 25). But the *High Church party* in their hostility to a settlement which so greatly tended to strengthen the Protestant succession, either took or feigned alarm at the designation of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland as the “*true Protestant Religion*,” and demanded that a similar and separate guarantee should be given by the authority of Parliament to the Established Church in England. A Bill for this object, promoted by the *zealous Churchmen* was introduced by the Archbishop (*vide* Lord Stanhope’s *Queen Anne*, p. 275). It stands in the Statute Book, 5 Anne, cap. v. It was incorporated in the Act of the Union, 5 Anne, cap. viii, Art. 25, sect. 7, and is entitled an Act

* I add that this history of the Church (FOX’S MARTYRS) was of such value and esteem for the use of it to Christian readers and the service of our religion Reformed, that it was in the days of Queen Elizabeth enjoined to be set up in some convenient place in all the Parish Churches, together with the BIBLE and BISHOP JEWELL’S *Defence of the Apology of the Church of England*, to be read at all suitable times by the people before or after service.”—(STYRPE’S *Annals of the Reformation* vol. iii. pt. 1, p. 738.)

for securing the Church of England by law established. The memorable recital of that re-settlement is as follows :—

“Whereas it is reasonable and necessary that the *true Protestant religion professed and established in the Church of England*, and the doctrines, worship, discipline, and government thereof should be effectually and unalterably secured.”

Thereupon the Act proceeds to re-enact the Acts of Uniformity of Elizabeth and Charles II, and other Acts for the establishment and preservation of the Church of England, with a special provision with respect to the Coronation Oath.

A century afterwards the union with Ireland was effected. The 5th Article of the Act of Union 39 and 40 George III. cap. 67, declares “that the Churches of England and Ireland, as now by law established be united in one *Protestant Episcopal Church*.” Later still, in 1829, when the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed, the Church of England (10 George IV. cap. 7.) is spoken of, Sect. 2, as the “*Protestant Religion*,” and the Government as the “*Protestant Government*,” and in Sect. 24, the Church of England is designated as the “*Protestant Episcopal Church*.”—See *Sir W. V. Harcourt’s letter to the Times*, July 27, 1874.*

Before we review the ecclesiastical relations of the Church of England, it is important to dwell for a moment upon one fallacy which distinguishes these novel attempts to un-protestantise her. We are told for instance, in reply to the constitutional argument, that “it really amounts to this, that Parliament—a *secular body*—has higher pretensions to theological accuracy than the *Divines* who established the Liturgy of the Church of England.”† If the Church had not been the Church of England, but all along a body dissevered from the State, we could allow some force to the reasoning; but to imagine that up to the period at least of 1828, when the TEST and CORPORATION ACTS were repealed (9 Geo. IV. c. 17), there could have been any conflict without a catastrophe between the principles of the *National Church* and those of the *National Legislature* is, from the nature of things, a glaring absurdity. Parliament is in theory but an epitome of the nation, and the recognized tribunal for eliciting and expressing its judgment. If we dismiss Parliament from our consideration we dismiss the nation, and if we dismiss the nation, what becomes of the *National Church*? The fact is, that the men who try to persuade us that we have not been what we have been, Protestant—and are not what we are, Protestant—pursue a hazy indefinite abstraction which they call “the Church.” Their cloudy conceptions are unknown to the simple teaching which lies before us:—“The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men.” (Art. XIX)—not a small committee of “Divines” or “Clergy.” To suppose that this “congregation of faithful men” at any period of

* This irrefutable argument is met by quibbles about the “verbal infallibility of Acts of Parliament.” It is not a question of “verbal infallibility of an Act of Parliament,” but of a *fundamental compact of the Constitution*, whereby the Church has secured certain *rights*, and contracted certain—*obligations*.

† Is the Church of England Protestant? p. 30.

our history could have had two sets of diverging principles animating their ecclesiastical and civil polity respectively, is to suppose an impossibility. Congruity between the Protestant character impressed upon the National Church and the deeply cherished Protestant sentiment of the national heart, seems to be the necessary alternative to disestablishment.

Hence when we pass on to contemplate the present condition of things, we find that this Protestantism of the nation and of the Church is regarded as an almost insuperable obstacle by those whose boasted mission it is to eradicate the principles of the Reformation. Better testimony we cannot desire than what they voluntarily render. In a volume of "Essays on the Re-union of Christendom, 1867," edited by DR. LEE, and prefaced by an Essay of DR. PUSEY, we learn amongst other things:—

"The first great difficulty that is before us arises from the *Protestantism of England*. Till this is removed, the re-union of our Church as the Church of England with either the Greek or Latin Churches is absolutely hopeless."—p. 89.

Again,

"A fair vision certainly, but there is this little obstacle to its fulfilment. *England is Protestant to the backbone. Protestantism is ingrained into her Constitution, her laws, her social system, and her religious habits. It has all but (sic) invaded the Ritual* of her Church (!) as it certainly has full possession of the minds of the vast majority of her clergy.*"—p. 90.

So also:—

"The fact, however, stands before us, and it is a melancholy fact, that the Church of England is isolated in Christendom." Note—"By this term (the Church of England) is included, not simply those Colonial Churches in communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, but also the *Protestant Episcopal Communion*s in Scotland and America."—p. 207.

And once more:—

"The objection in fact amounts to this—It is impossible to make England Catholic again. . . . Now we can understand such an objection as this coming from one who disbelieved in Christianity, or who abhorred Catholicism, or from one who *agreed heart and soul with the Protestantism of the Establishment* or the *still vaguer Protestantism of England at large.*"—p. 259.

The homage thus paid to the cardinal fact of our Protestantism by the Ritualistic leaders amply disposes of the fanciful utterances of some of their followers.

From the Constitutional position and Legal definition of the Church of England we proceed to consider her *Ecclesiastical Relations*.

It would require an epitome of BURNET, STRYPE, and other authors, to unfold the close intercourse which subsisted between the chiefs of the Reformation at home and abroad. The history of the

* As, for instance, the abolition of the word *Altar* from her service Book!

period voluminously attests the influence upon the Church of England of such men as CALVIN, PETER MARTYR, MARTIN BUCER, BULLINGER, GUALTER, and others. That the communion between the Reformed Churches abroad and at home, was not drawn closer was due to our insular position, and to the difficulty of communication, not to any want of will or effort.

HEYLIN, the High Church historian of the Reformation, ventures to assert that Cranmer refused the proffered assistance of Calvin (*Hist. Ref.* p. 65). He gives no documentary proof, and it is a thing *inconsistent* with what we know of their relations. But HEYLIN does not tell us a fact we learn from other sources: "1560. In this year John Calvin wrote to Archbishop Parker, importing how he rejoiced in the happiness of England, and that God had raised up so gracious a Queen to be instrumental in propagating the true faith of Jesus Christ by restoring the Gospel, and expelling Idolatry together with the Bishop of Rome's usurped power, and then made a serious motion of *uniting Protestants together*. He entreated the Archbishop to prevail with Her Majesty to summon a general assembly of *all the Protestant clergy wherever dispersed*, and that a set form and method of Public service and Government of the Church might be established not only within her dominions, but also among all the Reformed and Evangelick Churches abroad."

This was a noble offer, and the Archbishop acquainted the Queen's Council with it. They took it into consideration and desired His Grace to thank Calvin, and to let him know they liked his proposals which were fair and desirable; but that the Church of England would retain Episcopacy. This was a great work, and weighed on the Archbishop to set on foot, when news arrived that Calvin was dead.

"Perusing some papers of Archbishop Parker, we find that John Calvin and others of the Protestant Churches of Germany and elsewhere would have had Episcopacy if permitted."

"Calvin, Bullinger, and other learned men had written to Edward VI. in 1549, offering to make him their Defender, and to have Bishops in their Churches for better unity and concord. This letter, *two Bishops, Gardiner and Bonner, intercepted, whereby Calvin's overture perished*. And he received an answer *as if it had been* from the Reformed Divines of those times, wherein they checked him and slighted his proposals."—*Strype's Life of Parker*, fol. 69, 70.

In those troublous times to assemble such a Protestant Conference was no easy matter.* Such a Conference however assembled at Frankfort in 1577.

"There was a great and long desired design among all Protestants now in hand in order to unite them in a profession of the same faith and doctrine. In order to which a council was held this year (1577) at Frankfort, for the drawing up a common confession of all Reformed Churches. To this Council, to assist at it the Queen sent her ambassador, showing her concurrence in this useful affair. The province of drawing up the Confession was committed to ZACHARIAS URSINUS, the

* What measures the Papacy adopted to counteract it, may be learned from the continuation of Strype's narrative.—(See STRYPE'S *Annals*, Vol. II, Pt. ii.)

learned Professor of Heidelberg, who had been formerly a hearer of MELANCTHON and PETER MARTYR. What the issue was, and what particular esteem the Queen obtained for this with the Protestants of Germany and Switzerland will appear from a letter of RALPH GUALTER, chief minister of Zurich, to the Bishop of Ely. GUALTER speaks of a '*common confession which they had decreed in the Synod of Frankfort, the ambassador of the most serene Queen being present, and moderating the whole business.*' But that Zacharias Ursinus put a delay to the whole business, who declined to undertake the work of drawing it up, which was committed unto him.'—(*Strype's Annals*, Vol. II. Pt. ii. 103.)

This intimacy with the foreign Protestant Divines was something more than nominal. Even in the year 1578, when the deficiency in manuals of instruction had been supplied by DEAN NOWELL's Catechisms and the exclusive use of them enjoined by the Canons of 1572, the Catechisms of *Calvin* and *Bullinger* were still ordered by statute to be used as well as others in the University of Oxford.—*Cardwell's Doc. Annals*, Vol. I. 266.)

Dissemination and authorization were not only given to their writings, but the Ministers of other Protestant Churches were admitted to benefices and preferment without Episcopal ordination.

WHITTINGHAM, Dean of Durham (1578), had received his orders at Geneva.

JOHN MORRISON, ordained by Presbyterians in Scotland, was licensed by the Archbishop in 1582 to preach and administer holy things throughout the Province of Canterbury.

"It is certain also that instances may be given, down to the time of the Civil War, of Foreigners holding *preferment without Episcopal ordination*; but the Act of Uniformity (13 and 14 Chas. II. cap. 4) made such ordination indispensable for the future."—(*Cardwell's Doc. Annals*, Vol. II. p. 45.)

The assistance rendered to Protestants abroad was accompanied by protection and fraternal sympathy shown to those at home who took refuge among ourselves. French and German churches were founded in London during the reign of Edward VI., retaining their own forms and discipline, and receiving special privileges, immunities, *churches*, and *charters*. Broken up during the reign of Mary, they were restored upon the accession of Elizabeth, in whose reign additional foreign churches were established. A Dutch Church occupied the west part of the Church of the Augustine Friars in Broad Street, granted to them by King Edward VI. by royal letters patent. This Church soon after chose Grindal, Bishop of London, their superintendent, "who did show himself on all occasions a true patron to them, and concerned himself tenderly in their affairs."

After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes a crowd of Huguenots poured into this country. A French Church, with its own form of worship, was established in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral, *where it continues to this day*.

But in closing this part of the subject we ought not to omit mention of the Synod of Dort in 1618, at which were gathered ministers from the various Protestant Churches in Europe, "whither our king sent Dr. George Carlton, Bishop of Llandaff; Dr. Hall, Dean of

Worcester; Dr. John Davenant, Regius Professor in Cambridge, and Master of Queen's College; and Dr. Samuel Ward, Regent of Sidney College, Cambridge; divines of great reputation, sound learning, and well-grounded faith. There they met with divers divines from Switzerland and Germany, besides the natives of the Netherlands, who altogether in a full Synod quashed, as much as in them lay, the Arminian opinions."*—(*Dr. Kennet. Complete History of Eng. Vol. II. p. 719.*)

By the writers of the Caroline period the term *Protestant* is always applied to the Church of England. Heylin more than once anticipates the Coronation oath by using the same words, "*the true Protestant religion established by law*" (*vide Life of Laud*, pp. 54, 104, 219, 229, 251, 524, 525, &c.); and in one place he applies the term "professors" to those of the Lutheran persuasion, in contrast with the term *Protestant* which he attaches to the Church of England. Speaking of Queen Mary, he says:—

"Notwithstanding the care of her inquisitors, many good books of true Christian consolation and good *Protestant doctrine* did either find some press in London, or were sent over to their brethren by such learned men as had retired to their places of retreat, amongst which I find none but Emden in the Lutheran countries, the rigid Professors of which churches abominated nothing more than an *English Protestant*, because they concurred not with them in the monstrous doctrine of 'ubiquity' and their device of consubstantiation."—Heylin, *Hist. of Ref.*, 250.

The period of the Restoration was a period *emphatically* Protestant. The Church of England had passed through a time of stormy trial and affliction, and her re-establishment was attended by strong measures directed against those who had laid strong hands upon her. Yet though circumstances, aided by the theological tone LAUD had bequeathed, rendered her jealous of Nonconformity, her antipathy to Popery and staunch fidelity to her Protestant principles were not less loudly asserted. With the vices and depravity of CHARLES we are not concerned. His public and official acts belong to the great constitutional settlement in progress. "In the time of Charles II." we are told, "Protestantism had become so fashionable and vehement, that a man whose Protestantism was doubtful incurred no small danger."†

* King Charles I. wrote a Declaration in Latin, dated Oxford, May 14, 1644, addressed with his greeting to "all Foreign Protestant Churches." "To all those who profess the true Reformed Protestant Religion, of what nation, degree, or condition soever they be," to contradict the rumour of his inclination to Popery. In this Declaration he alludes to the Synod of Dort thus:—

"Which Liturgy and Discipline (of the Church of England) the most eminent of Protestant authors, as well Germans as French, as well Danes as Swedes, and Switzers as well Belgians as Bohemians, do with many Elogies (and not without a kind of envy) approve and applaud in their public writings, particularly in the transactions of the Synod of Dort, wherein besides other of our Divines (who afterwards were Prelates) one of our Bishops assisted, to whose dignity all due respects and precedence were given."—*Rushworth*, Vol. V. p. 75.

† "Is the Church of England Protestant?" p. 24.

The confession is valuable. Though we smile at the sneer, we cannot so briefly dismiss events among the most important of our history.

Charles in his "Letter to the Commons addressed from Breda," (1660) says :—

"If you desire the advancement and propagation of the Protestant religion, we have by our constant profession, and practice of it, given sufficient testimony to the world, that neither the unkindness of those of the same faith towards us, nor the civilities and obligations of those of a contrary profession, (of both of which we have had abundant evidence) could in the least degree startle us, or make us swerve from it. And nothing can be proposed to manifest our zeal and affection for it to which we will not readily consent."—(*Kennet's Comp. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 223.

Immediately after his accession, the king issued a remarkable "declaration to all his loving subjects concerning Ecclesiastical affairs." In it, after repeating the extract just given from his letter to the Commons, he proceeds :—

"As we then said, that we did hope in due time ourselves to propose somewhat for the *propagation* of it (the Protestant Religion) that will satisfy the world that we have always made it both our care, and our study, and have enough observed what is most likely to bring disadvantage to it. And the truth is, we do think ourselves more competent to propose, and with God's assistance to determine many things now in difference from the time we have spent, and the experience we have had in most of the Reformed Churches abroad, in France, in the Low Countries, and in Germany, where we have had frequent conferences with the most learned men who have unanimously lamented the great reproach the *Protestant religion* undergoes from the distempers, and too notorious schisms in matters of religion in England. And as the most learned among them, have always, with great submission and reverence acknowledged and magnified the established government of the Church of England, and the great countenance and shelter the Protestant religion received from it before these unhappy times, so, many of them have with great ingenuity and sorrow confessed that they were too easily misled by misinformation and prejudice into some disesteem of it, as if it had too much complied with the Church of Rome, whereas they now acknowledge it to be the *best fence* God hath yet raised against Popery in the world."—(*Kennet's Comp. Hist.* III. p. 225.)

The outcome of the king's intentions was the Conference at the Savoy (1661) to accommodate matters between the Episcopalians and Nonconformists—a conference rendered abortive through the unyielding temper of both sides.*

The most remarkable thing is, that whilst the Legislature throughout this reign was most vehement and vigilant in protecting the interests of *Protestantism*, it was not less specially zealous for the privileges of the Church of England. Hence at an early period of his reign, when Charles with stealthy purpose was inclined to a Declaration of Indulgence towards Dissenters, a prelude specious but dangerous, and copied with more audacity by his Popish successor, he was immediately met by an Address from his Parliament against

* See note at the close of the paper.

it. Hence the Act of Uniformity—the Corporation Act—the Five Mile Act. Then came to him “Representations from the Lords and Commons concerning the dangers of Popery.” In the same year (1662) that a “Proclamation was issued against Priests and Jesuits,” containing the stereotyped effusion of Royal zeal for the Protestant Religion, articles were exhibited against Lord Clarendon by the Earl of Bristol, one of which affirmed: “that His Majesty was dangerously corrupted in his Religion and inclined to Popery.” From this indication of general surmise we can understand the vigilant attitude of the nation against the subtle and disgraceful schemes of a semi-Popish King, whose hypocrisy was the homage paid to its Protestant feeling—a feeling, which, if trifled with by pretended Popish plots, received attestation nevertheless from the advantage thus taken of it by their contrivers. As time advanced, Addresses and Messages between the King and Parliament became more frequent.* The King’s “Declaration of Indulgence” was rightly divined to be politically devised really in the interest of Popery, and gave rise to the Test Act, “requiring all persons bearing any office or place of trust” to take the Sacrament publicly according to the Rite of the Church of England, the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, and to subscribe the declaration following:

“I, A. B., do declare that I do believe there is not any Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper or in the elements of bread and wine at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.” “Which Act and Test were a great security to the Protestant religion.”—*Kennet’s Complete History*, Vol. III. p. 294.)

But perhaps the most remarkable event of this kind, connected with the Protestantism of the Church of England, was an Act “to prevent the dangers that may arise from persons disaffected to the Government,” (1675) . . . whereby was imposed an Oath or Test of Abhorrence by all who enjoyed any beneficial offices,—*Ecclesiastical*, Civil, Military, and by all Privy Councillors, Justices of the Peace and Members of Parliament.

It was at first proposed to be of the same form with the oath required from the Dissenting Ministers by the Oxford Five Mile Act:—

“I do swear that I will not at any time to come endeavour the alteration of the Government either in Church or State.”—(*Kennet, Comp. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 259.)

The question gave rise in the Lords to a most stormy debate, which lasted seventeen days.

“There were two powerful parties in the House, one for, and the other against the Bill, and the votes of the Bishops turned the scale on the side of the first. The

* As a specimen of these communications we may give the King’s reply to an Address of the Commons with reference to the Exclusion Bill (1678).

“Gentlemen, it shall always be my study to preserve the Protestant Religion, and to advance and support the interest of my people.”—*Kennet’s History*, III. p. 366.)

More than twenty such records might be quoted from this historian.

great speakers for the Bill were, the Lord Treasurer and the Lord Keeper, with BISHOP MORLEY and BISHOP WARD. The speakers against it were, the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Lords HOLLES, HALLIFAX, and the Earl of Salisbury. . . . It must be observed that *this Bill was contrived by the Church party*, and was disliked by the Duke and the Papists in general, because they thought that bringing any Test in practice would certainly bring one that would turn them out of the house.”—(*Rapin and Tyndal's Hist.* Vol. II. fol. 677.)

And we may add from KENNET:—

“They pleaded that this oath would be destructive of the privileges of the House, which was to vote freely and not to be pre-obliged by an oath to the Prelates.”

The Bill passed, and the Test was reduced to these words of a declaration and an oath:—

“I, A. B. do declare that it is not lawful on any pretence whatsoever to take arms against the king, and I do abhor the traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or against those that are commissioned by him according to law, in times of rebellion and war, as acting in pursuance of such commission.

“I, A. B. do swear that I will not endeavour any alteration in the Protestant religion now established by law in the Church of England, nor will I endeavour any alteration in the Government of this Kingdom in Church and State, as it is by law established.”—(*Kennet's Comp. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 333.)

With the prospect before them of a Popish successor, the Protestant efforts of the Legislature grew apace, and the “Exclusion Bill” well nigh caused a rupture once more between the Crown and Parliament. The infatuation, Popish acts, and arbitrary measures of James II. precipitated the crisis. The expulsion of the Fellows from Magdalen College, Oxford—the Court of High Commission—Suspension of the Bishop of London, and lastly the Trial of the Seven Bishops united the nation in one firm phalanx of resistance. The Church of England by identifying her own with the Protestant interests of the nation, received an accession of strength which secured and solidified her foundations. Among the measures which were taken to invite the Prince of Orange, we find a document of some interest to our argument.

“1688. Under this disposition of the King to Popery, and of the people to self-defence, this MEMORIAL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND was presented to their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Orange:—

“Your Royal Highnesses cannot be ignorant that the Protestants of England, who continue true to their Religion and Government, established by law, have been many ways troubled and vexed by restless controversies and things required of them unaccountable before God and man. Ecclesiastical benefits and preferments taken from them without any other reason but the king's pleasure: that they have been summoned and sentenced by Ecclesiastical Commissioners contrary to law.’ . . . (then follows a list of complaints against the tyrannical and illegal acts of James).

“That they most humbly implore the protection of your Royal Highness as to the suspending and encroachments made upon the law for the maintenance of the

Protestant Religion, our civil and fundamental rights and privileges, &c. &c."—
(*Kennet's Comp. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 488.)

Then it was, when a common danger dissipated differences and inspired all with a common enthusiasm for a common Protestantism, that the scheme of a Comprehension, which was rife at the dawn of the succeeding reign, appeared both necessary and feasible.

"In 1688 the cause of the Hierarchy was for a moment that of the popular party. More than *nine thousand clergymen* with the Primate and his most respectable suffragans at their head offered themselves to endure bonds, and the spoiling of their goods for the great fundamental principles of our Constitution. The effect was a coalition which included the most zealous Cavaliers, the most zealous Republicans, and all the intermediate sections of the community. The spirit which had supported HAMPDEN in the preceding generation—the spirit which in the succeeding generation supported SACHEVERELL combined to support the Archbishop (SANCROFT), who was HAMPDEN and SACHEVERELL in one. Those classes of society which are most deeply interested in the preservation of order, followed without scruple the guidance of a venerable man, the first Peer of Parliament, the first minister of the Church, a Tory in politics, a saint in manners, whom tyranny had in his own despite turned into a demagogue. Many, on the other hand, who had always abhorred Episcopacy as a relic of Popery, and as an instrument of arbitrary power, now asked on bended knees the blessing of a Prelate who was ready to wear fetters and to lay his aged limbs on bare stones rather than *betray the interests of the Protestant Religion*, and set the prerogative above the laws. . . .

"Actuated by these sentiments our ancestors arrayed themselves against the Government in one huge and compact mass. All ranks, all parties, all Protestant sects, made up that vast phalanx. In the van were the Lords Spiritual and Temporal. Then came the landed gentry, and the Clergy, both the Universities, all the Inns of Court, merchants, shopkeepers, farmers, the porters who plied in the streets of the great towns, the peasants who ploughed the fields. . . . The old *Exclusionist* took the old *Abhorrer* by the hand. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists forgot their long feud, and remembered only *their common Protestantism* and their common danger. Divines bred in the school of LAUD talked loudly not only of toleration but *comprehension*. The Archbishop (SANCROFT)* soon after his acquittal put forth a pastoral letter *which is one of the most remarkable compositions of the age*. He had from his youth been at war with the Non-conformists, and had repeatedly assailed them with unjust and unchristian asperity. His principal work was a *hideous caricature of the Calvinistic theology*. He had drawn up for the 30th of January and for the 29th of May, Forms of Prayer which reflected on the Puritans in language so strong that the Government had thought it best to soften it down. But now his heart was melted and opened. He solemnly enjoined the Bishops and Clergy to have a very tender regard to *their brethren, the Protestant Dissenters*—to visit them often, to entertain them hospitably, to discourse with them civilly, to persuade them, if it might be, to conform to the Church, but if that were found impossible, to *join them heartily and affectionately in exertions for the blessed cause of the Reformation*."

(*Macaulay's History of England*, Vol. III. p. 127-130.)

* A Non-juror be it remembered.

And we are told in this our day, that the Church of England is not, and has never been—PROTESTANT!!

Since the time of the Reformation until recently no one within the bounds of the Church of England has dreamt of questioning her cardinal characteristic of Protestantism. The most eminent members of the High Church party* have not been less loud in proclaiming their regard for the *Protestantism* of the Church of England than those of the rival school. We select two as typical men, each the leader of the High Church party in his day. Both were brought to trial, and both took occasion to declare their unequivocal attachment and loyalty to *Protestantism*—we allude to Archbishop LAUD and Bishop ATTERBURY.

Archbishop Laud on his trial, thus addresses the Peers :—

"Nay, my lords, I am as innocent in this business of Religion—as free from all practice, or so much as thought of practice, for any alteration to Popery, or any way blemishing the *true Protestant Religion established in the Church of England*, as I was when my mother bore me into the world. . . . I beseech your lordships consider it well. For surely if I had blemished the *true Protestant Religion*, I could not have settled such men in it . . . how void of charity this speech is, and how full of falsehood, shall appear by the number of those persons whom by God's blessing upon my labours, I have settled in the *true Protestant Religion established in England*."—*State Trials*, Vol. IV.

In his dying speech on the scaffold, Jan. 10, 1644, Laud vindicates King Charles† thus :—

* The Caroline Bishops under Laud's primacy were certainly no timid members of the High Church School of which Laud was the eminent chief. WREN and others have left their mark on the History of the time. For brevity's sake we will establish the *Protestantism* of all these men at once by referring to a remarkable Protestation taken by the Legislature in 1641. It ran thus :—

"I, A. B., in the presence of Almighty God, promise and *protest* to maintain and defend as far as I lawfully may with my life, power and estate the *true Reformed Protestant Religion* expressed in the Doctrines of the Church of England, against all popery and *popish innovation* within this realm contrary to the said doctrine, &c. Among those who took this Protestant Oath on May 4, 1641, were the BISHOPS of Durham, Lincoln, Gloucester, Carlisle, Bath and Wells, Hereford, Bristol, Rochester. Llandaff; on May 5, 1641, Winchester, Oxford, St. Asaph, Ely (MATTHEW WREN), Peterborough, Litchfield; on May 10, 1641, Chester; and on May 11, 1641, Chichester."—(*Kishworth*, Vol. IV. pp. 241, 247, 248.)

† Charles himself had voluntarily and publicly made a memorable and solemn Protestation to this effect :—1643. The King being about to receive the Sacrament from the hands of Archbishop Usher at Christ Church, Oxford, rising from his knees and beckoning to the Archbishop for a further forbearance, made this Protestation :—

"My lord, I espy here many resolved Protestants who may declare to the world the Resolution I do now make. I have to the utmost of my power prepared my soul to become a worthy receiver. And may I so receive comfort from the blessed Sacrament as I do intend the Establishment of the *true Reformed Protestant Religion as it stood in its beauty in the happy days of Queen Elizabeth*, without any connivance at Popery. I bless God that in the midst of these public dis-

"I know him to be as free from this charge (of *bringing in Popery*) as any man living, and I hold him to be as *sound a Protestant* according to religion by law established as any man in this kingdom."

Of himself he says:—

"This is no time to dissemble with God, least of all in matters of Religion, and therefore I desire it *may be remembered* I have always lived in the *Protestant Religion* established in England, and in that I come now to die."—*Heylin's Life of Laud*, 534.

Bishop ATTERBURY was also the eminent leader of the High Church party in his day. He was brought to trial in 1723 for his participation in a plot to favour the Pretender. In his eloquent defence before the House of Lords, he thus expresses himself:—

"Was I influenced by any dislike of the Established Religion—any secret inclination towards Popery, a church of greater pomp and power? Malice has ventured thus far to asperse me. I have, my lords, ever since I knew what Popery was, disliked it, and the better I knew it the more I opposed it. . . . Thirty-seven years ago I wrote in defence of Martin Luther . . . and whatever happens to me I will suffer anything, and would by God's grace burn at the stake rather than in any material point depart from the *Protestant Religion* as professed in the Church of England."—*Lord Mahon's Hist. of Eng.* ii. 46.

A statement has been made, and in spite of contradiction industriously circulated,

"That *Convocation* never acknowledged the term *Protestant*, and in fact not only has the Church never accepted this designation but at a most serious crisis in her history, the Lower House of Convocation deliberately repudiated it."

Such is the statement of a recent writer in the second edition of his *Tract*.* In the first it ran thus:—

"Not only has the Church never accepted this designation, but at a most serious crisis in her history *she* deliberately rejected it."

A slight course of inquiry into the matter seems to have led to the trifling change of the "*Lower House of Convocation*" for "*the Church*." Ignorance of real facts, and a careless remark of Burnet, led some one to make this unwarrantable assertion, which was recklessly copied by others. For its dissemination after refutation there is no excuse. Historical accuracy in face of the proofs supplied to the writer, should have led to the excision of the whole passage, or to its alteration thus:—

"Not only has the Church never refused this designation—*Protestant*—but in the official records of Convocation has left proof that she has deliberately avowed it."

"tractions, I have still liberty to communicate, and may this Sacrament be my damnation, if my heart do not join with my lips in this Protestation."—(*Dr. Kennet, Comp. Hist. of England*, Vol. III. p. 135).

* Is the Church of England Protestant? A Historical Essay, by Homersham Cox, M.A. A Judge of County Courts. London: Longmans.

This we proceed to show :—

King William III. had failed in his design of uniting his Protestant subjects by the admission of those, who were willing and able to serve, into employment and benefices; yet so desirous was he of this union, that he resolved to try to obtain by Convocation what he had in vain endeavoured to obtain by Parliament.

The project of a *Comprehension* was set on foot so as to bring the Presbyterians and Dissenters into relation with the Church; and a Commission was appointed, with the sanction of the Archbishop and other Divines, to review the Liturgy and Canons, and prepare suitable alterations. The party which was at work for King James took hold of the occasion to inflame men's minds. It was said that the Church was to be pulled down, and Presbytery to be set up. The Universities took fire, and began to declare against it, and against all who promoted it as men who intended to undermine the Church. Active canvassing for Proctors to be sent to Convocation took place, so that it was soon apparent that the Clergy (at least of the Lower House) were not in a temper cool or calm enough to encourage the further prosecution of the design.

In this temper Convocation met (1689). The Clergy of the Lower House were alarmed lest the Compromise to accommodate the Dissenters should be bought at the sacrifice of Church Privileges, and hence they were jealous not about the application of the word *Protestant* to the *Church of England*, but lest by the use of *general terms* they should be committed to the *comprehension* they resisted. What they cared for was the clear expression of *established Churches*, which excluded Dissenters, in lieu of the word *religion* which included them.

The King's address was as follows :—

“ WILLIAM R.

His Majesty has summoned this Convocation not only because it is usual upon holding a Parliament, but out of a pious zeal to do everything that may tend to the best establishment of the Church of England, which is so eminent a part of the Reformation, and is certainly the best suited to the constitution of this government, and therefore does most signally deserve, and shall always have both his favour and protection, and he doubts not but that you will assist him in promoting the welfare of it, so that no prejudices with which some men may have laboured to possess you shall disappoint his good intentions to deprive the Church of any benefit from your consultations. His Majesty therefore expects that the things that shall be proposed shall be calmly and impartially considered by you; and assures you that he will offer nothing to you but what shall be for the honour, peace and advantage of the Protestant Religion in general, and particularly of the Church of England.”

The Upper House of Convocation drew up the following reply to the Crown—

“ We the Bishops, &c., in Convocation assembled, having received your Majesty's gracious message, together with a Commission from your Majesty, by the Earl of Nottingham, hold ourselves bound in gratitude and duty to return our most

numble thanks, and acknowledgment of the grace and goodness expressed in your Majesty's message, and the zeal you show in it for the PROTESTANT RELIGION IN GENERAL and the Church of England in particular, and of the trust and confidence reposed in us by this Commission, we look on these marks of your Majesty's care and favour as the continuance of the great deliverance Almighty God wrought for us by your means in making you the blessed instrument of preventing us from falling under the cruelty of Popish tyranny; for which as we have often thanked Almighty God, so we cannot forget that high obligation and duty which we owe to your Majesty; and on these new assurances of your protection and favour to our Church we beg leave to renew the assurance of our constant fidelity and obedience to your Majesty, whom we pray God to continue long and happily to reign over us."

It was not the word *Protestant*, but the words *religion in general* attached to it which excited the apprehension of the Lower House, strenuously opposed to the scheme of *Comprehension*. They regarded the words as indicating a policy to which they would not commit themselves. Hence, in the correspondence between the two Houses, they resolved, "that instead of the *Protestant Religion* they would rather say *Protestant Churches*." Finally, an address was agreed upon by both Houses, which was signed by the whole Convocation, and presented to the King. It ran thus:—

"We your Majesty's most loyal and most dutiful subjects, the Bishops and Clergy of the Province of Canterbury in Convocation assembled, having received a most gracious message from your Majesty by the Earl of Nottingham, hold ourselves bound in duty and gratitude to return our most humble acknowledgment for the same, and for the pious zeal and care your Majesty is pleased to express therein for the honour, peace, advantage, and establishment of the Church of England, whereby we doubt not the interest of the *Protestant Religion* in ALL OTHER *Protestant Churches* which is *dear to us*, will be better secured under the influence of your Majesty's government and protection. And we crave leave to assure your Majesty that in pursuance of that trust and confidence you repose in us, we will consider whatever shall be offered to us from your Majesty without prejudice, and with all calmness and impartiality, and we will constantly pay the fidelity and allegiance which we have all sworn to your Majesty and the Queen, whom we pray God to continue long and happily to reign over us."—*Cardwell's Synodalia*, Vol. II., pp. 697, 698.

A comparison of this amended address, with the one which emanated from the Bishops, will show how much stronger the expression of *Protestantism* is in the former than in the latter, yet the Ritualistic publication above alluded to gravely asserts:—

"The Address in its amended form was quite different from that originally framed, and omitted all allusion to the *Protestant Religion*!"

When the Comprehension Scheme fell through, the Lower House seems to have recovered "the calmness and impartiality" of which the address speaks. Fortunately for us in these days of bold perversion and reckless assertion, the Records of Convocation contain a document which once for all clearly settles the question, and disposes

of this gratuitous aspersion cast upon the prominent characteristic of the Church of England.

We invite attention to the circumstances connected with the Convocation of 1701.

1701. A new Convocation of the Province of Canterbury being summoned to meet in concurrence with the new Parliament was opened in the Cathedral Church of Saint Paul, London, with solemn prayers, and an excellent Latin sermon, preached by Dr. William Sherlock, Dean of that church, on Epist. Jude ver. 3. In the choice of a Prolocutor, the competition was between the learned Dr. Beveridge, Archdeacon of Colchester, and Dr. Woodward, Dean of Sarum, a civilian grown popular by opposing his Diocesan, to whom he owed his preferments. He was by a majority elected, and confirmed by the Archbishop. The first Synodical Act was an Address to the King, presented by the Archbishop, at the Head of the Bishops and Clergy to his Majesty at Kensington on Jan. 22.

"Most gracious Sovereign,

"We humbly beg leave to lay before your Majesty, now we are Assembled in Convocation, the deep resentment that every one of us had, at our first hearing of the great indignity which the French King offered to your Majesty and your people in declaring the pretended Prince of Wales to be King of your Majesty's Realms and Dominions.

"We do hereupon take occasion to renew our sincere Protestations of a firm and unshaken allegiance to your Majesty, humbly assuring your Majesty that we will do our utmost endeavours, by God's assistance in our respective places and stations, to defend your sacred person, and to maintain your Majesty's rightful title to the Imperial Crown of these Realms, and the succession thereof in the Protestant line, as now by law established, against the said pretended Prince, and all other your Majesty's open and secret enemies.

"We will always, according to our especial duty, make it our earnest prayer to God that He will long continue your Majesty's happy reign over us, that you may perfect all those great works, in which He hath wonderfully conducted you with so much glory and success, for the peace and welfare of these kingdoms, and the support of your allies, the safety and tranquillity of Europe and the *preserving the Protestant Religion both here in this Church of England by law established, and in all other Protestant Churches.*"*

His Majesty seemed to be very well pleased with this venerable appearance, and made this gracious answer.

"My lords and the rest of the clergy,

"I cannot but be very much pleased with these expressions of your affection to me, and your concern for the honour of the nation, for maintaining the succes-

* The awkward consequence of this appeal to Convocation is ludicrously dismissed, in the Ritualistic publication before alluded to, by the lofty remark: "The voice of the Church is not heard in courtly orations, nor are her decrees proclaimed in the precincts of a king's palace." It is no question of "*decrees*," but of a simple *principle* which Convocation very naturally avowed. However unfavourably Convocation may be regarded by its critics, it is left to its avowed friends, it appears, to affix the stigma to it of practically "*speaking lies in hypocrisy*!"

sion to the crown in the Protestant line, and for the preservation of the Protestant Churches. And I am glad of this opportunity to give you fresh assurances of my firm resolution in an especial manner to protect and support the Church of England as by law established.”—(*Dr. Kennet’s Complete History of England*, Vol. III. p. 845.)

Among other references we might allude to the Convocation of 1713-14.

“The next day the Convocation which had met with the Parliament, and chosen Dr. STANHOPE, Prolocutor, complimented the Queen in a joint Address ‘on her recovery and happy return to her Royal city in health and safety,’ concluding with their wishes ‘that after a long and happy reign she might be able to transmit the protection of this Church and State to a *Protestant* successor in the illustrious house of Hanover.’”—(*Rapin and Tindal’s History*, Vol. IV. fol. 340.)

In 1717, when a grave attempt was threatened by the Pretender, Convocation presented a loyal and *indignant* Address, in which the following paragraph appears :

“We have seen in the late declarations of some of these men, *who nevertheless call themselves by the name of Protestants*, what we must look for should a Popish Prince ever sit upon the throne of these kingdoms.”—(*Rapin and Tindal, Hist.*, Vol. IV. fol. 514.)

In 1717, an unanimous Address from the Lords, thus expressing the voice of the Episcopate of the Church of England, was voted to the King, which concludes thus :

“We have a grateful sense of your Majesty’s concern for the Protestant Religion, and the Church of England, as by law established, which as it *always has been the chief of Protestant Churches*, so it can never be so well supported as by strengthening and uniting as far as may be the *Protestant interest*.”—(*Rapin and Tindal, Hist.*, Vol. IV. pt. ii. fol. 552.)

But why multiply instances?

Such is the answer to the challenge, “Search the Prayer-book through, and you will not find the word Protestant once used. Nowhere in the Articles, Liturgy or Homilies does it occur. If there were one instance—only one solitary instance in which the designation had been adopted by our Church : if on any single occasion from the period of the Reformation until the present time she had so designated herself, the Evangelicals would have some justification for their persistent endeavours to assimilate the English Church to the Kirk of Scotland, and the Lutheran and Calvinistic congregations of the Continent.”*

Under the peculiar circumstances of its origin, and of the Reformation itself it would have been singular if such a *general* polemical term as *Protestant* had made its appearance in the *particular* Service-book of a *particular* Church, considering the date, though the *Anti-Romanism* it expresses is abundantly pre-

* “Is the Church of England Protestant?” p. 1.

sent.* The omission of the word itself in this case is unimportant. What it stands for is there. But there is another word—**ALTAR**—the *prime* necessity of this *soi-disant Catholic* worship: (Direct. Anglic. p. 3), the very foundation stone on which the whole of its cumbrous and elaborate superstructure rests, which is likewise *missing*, and its omission is very grave, and very important. In a book claiming to be “The order of Common Prayer and *Administration of the Sacraments*, and other *rites and ceremonies* of the Church according to the use of the Church of England”—if anywhere, there we ought to find it. Without it, the entire edifice constructed upon it falls to the ground. Search the Prayer-book through and through, and you will not find the word—**ALTAR**. Nowhere in the Articles, Liturgy, Homilies, Canons, Nowell’s Catechism or other Catechisms does it occur; if there were one instance—only one solitary instance in these authorized Standards of the Church of England, in which the name had been sanctioned by our Church, or in any case which will bear the test of historical investigation, or is free from the infirmity of accidental circumstance. If on any single occasion of her independent existence since the Reformation until the present time, she had authoritatively restored what she with set purpose abolished, both name and thing, in 1552, the Ritualists might have some plausible pretext for their persistent endeavours to assimilate the English Church to the Church of Rome!

The men who advance this preposterous proposition that the Church of England is not Protestant, of whom we spoke at the commencement of this paper, happily termed by Sir W. Harcourt, “the Ultramontanes” of our Church, are equally unfortunate in arrogating to themselves the claim of being “Catholics.” The appellation they use in a tainted, theological sense, as signifying, if anything, a share in the corruptions of Rome, and a share in the pretensions of its Priesthood. A sect or party of which the history dates no further back than about thirty years, their misguided zeal is practically devoted to the betrayal and downfall of the Church of their fathers. The main preponderating voice of this Church denies to *them* the “Catholic” assumptions they boast. The Church of Rome repels *them* with contempt. The Greek Church holds no formal Communion with *them*. Even at the recent hap-hazard Convention at Bonn, it was deemed dignified by such men to advance a proof of the validity of Anglican orders, on the principle we suppose of “*qui s’excuse, s’accuse*.” The whole Nonconformist and Presbyterian Communities, the Protestant Churches of France, Holland, Scandinavia, Switzerland, Germany and America refuse them any such claim. Where in Christendom is this community and universality of time, place and person which they affect? A narrow sect numerically and theologically speaking, steeped in the heresies of Rome, or swayed by pre-reformation proclivities, and fast bordering on schism, they incessantly vaunt in their peculiar sense this word—“Catholic”—a presumption

* It has been well observed that the name of the Almighty does not once occur in the Book of Esther. What would become of the question of its inspiration if internal evidence did not supply it, irrespective of this fact?

only less absurd than their denial of the title *Protestant* to the Church of England in the face of Law, History and Fact.

A champion of this School admits, "If the Church of England is correctly designated Protestant the Evangelical party has an almost unassailable position." And his reviewer* adds:—

"If it be (Protestant) then the Evangelicals are right, and all the action of the Church Association is more than justified, and also the attempt now being made by Parliament in the same interest."

We have shown the correctness of the designation: we have established our justification; and we claim the impregnability of the position.

NOTE.

THE SAVOY CONFERENCE AND REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK IN 1662.

The thread of history pursued in this paper will convince any impartial mind of the truth of the position maintained, that the Church of England is essentially Protestant. Yet there are so many hazy misconceptions and distortions of fact to be met with, that we cannot but supplement the argument of the foregoing pages by a few remarks.

In the preface to a revised edition of the Prayer Book,† for instance, we meet with many statements loosely put together, very misleading, and, in some respects, utterly at variance with fact. We are told, with reference to the reign of ELIZABETH, "the altars which had been removed were replaced in the chancels." *This was never the case.* Whoever is acquainted with the Ecclesiastical history of the period will know that this is *utterly opposed to truth.* A misrepresentation as serious is contained in the statement, "In the revision under CHARLES II. many alterations were made in favour of Romish doctrine."

It may occur to our readers that some mysterious, indefinite change in the principles of the Church of England took place at this critical period. We must remove such a mischievous impression by a simple appeal to facts.

It was unfortunate that, smarting under the Puritanical lash which had been plentifully applied during the preceding reign, and taught by the painful history of irregularities due to the growth of nonconformity since the earlier years of ELIZABETH's reign, the Commissioners who met the Nonconformists at the Savoy Conference wrapped themselves in an impenetrable shroud of caution and obstinacy. Their unyielding temper was due to very natural causes. High Churchmen, such as, for the most part, would be deemed moderate in these days, they were rendered suspicious by experience and conservative by circumstance. They missed the golden opportunity to make concessions, which a wise forecast would have dictated, in their desire to preserve intact what had been *handed down to them.* We must throw ourselves back into the character and action of the times when they lived if we

* Review of Mr. Homersham Cox's Historical Essay—"Is the Church of England Protestant?"—(*Church Times*, Feb. 5, 1875.)

† The Book of Common Prayer, etc., prepared for use in the Evangelical churches by ministers and members of the Established and Nonconformist Churches. London: W. J. Johnson, 121, Fleet-street, 1870.

would understand the obstinate temper which was not confined to one side of the Conference.

Hence their whole endeavour was to fight for the Church of England against what they deemed *Puritan innovations*. Popery was far from their thoughts. Their efforts were directed to the preservation of the particular characteristics of order and discipline which marked the Church of England. It would be remote from our object to discuss the details of the Conference, but three things we desire to note:

(i.) When the Nonconformists, at the outset, presented their grievances, the Episcopalian party urged, as an argument in favour of the Service Book called in question, "that it was never found fault with by those to whom the name of *Protestant* most properly (*i.e., originally*) belongs, those that profess the Augustan Confession."—(*Cardwell's Conferences*, p. 338.)

(ii.) Our Articles, the *present standard of our doctrine*, were ratified by the same Ecclesiastical authorities that were responsible for our Prayer Book.

(iii.) They did not in anywise introduce any Romish element in their revision of the Prayer Book (of 1662). They obstinately withstood many excellent suggestions to improve it. They left some expressions dubious. They vindicated Episcopacy against the Presbyterians. They strenuously fought for the retention of the surplice, but *not* Popish vestments, and they made several concessions.

Nor was this all. The corrections proposed by SANCROFT and other advanced disciples of the Laudian School, "which *savoured* of their line of theology," "were all rejected, with the exception of the first two," which were unimportant.—(*Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences*, p. 391.)

By way of confirming what we state positively, "that *no* alterations were made in favour of Romish doctrine," we subjoin the most important of the actual additions and alterations made in the Prayer Book of ELIZABETH by the Commissioners in 1662.

- (1) The Sentences, the Epistles and Gospels, and other extracts from the Bible (except the Psalter and Ten Commandments) were taken from the version of 1611.
- (2) The Absolution was ordered to be pronounced by the priest alone, instead of by the minister.
- (3) The Book of Bel and the Dragon was reinstated in the Calendar of Lessons.*
- (4) The Prayers for the king, the royal family, the clergy and people together with the prayers of St. Chrysostom and the Benediction, were printed in the Order both of Morning and Evening Service, instead of being left, as formerly, at the end of the Litany.
- (5) The Evening Service, which previously began with the Lord's Prayer, was now opened with the Sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession, and Absolution, printed as in the Morning Service.
- (6) In the Litany the words "rebellion" and "schism" were added to the petition respecting "sedition, privy conspiracy," etc.
- (7) In a subsequent petition the words "bishops, priests, and deacons" were employed instead of "bishops, pastors, and ministers of the Church."
- (8) Among the occasional prayers and thanksgivings were now introduced, a second prayer for fair weather, the two prayers for the Ember weeks, the

* "The other books (the Apocrypha), as Hierome saith, the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of mauners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." (Art. VI.)

- prayers for the Parliament and for all conditions of men, ■ thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home, and the General Thanksgiving.
- (9) New Collects were appointed for the 3rd Sunday in Advent, and for St. Stephen's day.
 - (10) The Genealogy, which previously made part of the Gospel for the Sunday after Christmas, was now omitted.
 - (11) A distinct Collect, Epistle, and Gospel were provided for a Sixth Sunday after the Epiphany.
 - (12) The Gospels for the Sunday next before Easter and for Good Friday were shortened, having formerly contained within them respectively the Second Lesson for the day.
 - (13) In several places, as in one of the Collects for Good Friday, in those for the 5th and 16th Sundays after Trinity, for St. SIMON and St. JUDE, and in other places, the word "church" was used for congregation.
 - (14) A distinct Collect was supplied for Easter Even.
 - (15) The first of the Anthems used on Easter-day was added.
 - (16) A distinct Epistle was provided for the day of Purification.
 - (17) The last clause respecting saints departed was added to the Prayer for the Church Militant.
 - (18) The Rubric was added as to "covering what remaineth of the elements with a fair linen cloth."
 - (19) The order in Council respecting kneeling at the Lord's Supper which had been introduced in 1552 and removed by Queen Elizabeth, *was restored*, with this alteration: instead of "any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood," it is now read, "any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."
 - (20) A new office was appointed for the Baptism of such as are of riper years.
 - (21) The Preface to the Office for Confirmation was curtailed.
 - (22) The clause respecting the "undoubted salvation of baptized infants dying before the commission of actual sin was placed after the office for Infant Baptism."
 - (23) Some changes were made in the offices for Confirmation and Matrimony.
 - (24) In the Rubric at the end of the latter, the receiving the Communion on the day of the Marriage was no longer made imperative.
 - (25) In the VISITATION OF THE SICK the words "*if he humbly and heartily desire it*" were added to the Rubric respecting Absolution.
 - (26) The Benediction and the Prayers that follow appear now for the first time.
 - (27) In the ORDER FOR BURIAL the first rubric respecting persons unbaptized or excommunicated was added.
 - (28) Forms of Prayer were supplied to be used at Sea.
 - (29) Lastly, offices were provided for the 30th of January and the 30th of May and the *old service for the 5th of November* was corrected.—(*Cardwell's Hist. of Conferences*, 382-385.)

Such were the principal alterations, the only ones worth recording, made in Book of Common Prayer by the Convocation of 1662, and finally ratified by the Act of Uniformity. Two or three of them may seem to some persons at first sight to favour sacerdotalism, but a careful examination will establish the fact that whatever may have been the wishes of individuals among the revisers, no such result was attained. The Protestant character of the Church of England remains stamped on everything which has been put forth by authority.

THE NATURE OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

BY THE REV. CHARLES DENT BELL, M.A., HON. CANON OF CARLISLE
AND RECTOR OF CHELTENHAM,

Paper read at the Church Association Conference, held at Willis's
Rooms, King Street, St. James's, on the 10th of May, 1876.

WORSHIP is a religious instinct. It is not so much a duty as an impulse; not so much an obligation as a necessity. When Adam was in Paradise, his worship of God was perfect. When Adam fell his worship was marred. There was no longer the same free, frank fellowship with God—no longer the reverence, and the love once quickened into adoring rapture.

As time rolled on, man forgot God entirely; and the instinct of worship led him to pay homage to the creature, and to bow down before material things which he addressed in the language of prayer and praise, and to which he presented sacrifice in order to appease their wrath and to secure their favour. This ignorance of God was a guilty ignorance—"They did not *like* to retain God in their knowledge." It led to the grossest idolatry, for the religious instinct still survived, and that which was originally meant for man's health became to him an occasion of falling.

The Hebrews stood alone in the spirituality of their worship. They had first a tabernacle, and afterwards a temple, but both were without an idol, and the use of images was wholly forbidden in the service of religion. It is true that for a wise purpose God gave this people an imposing ceremonial, and an elaborate ritual, for He sought to teach them through the language of symbol and sign, certain spiritual truths, which it concerned them to know. The first covenant had much sensuous beauty and external magnificence. The vestments of the high priests were rich and splendid; the altars

were of pure gold or fine brass ; the curtains of the sanctuary were of blue, of purple and scarlet, and heavy with wrought embroidery ; there was the fragrance of incense, there were the strains of melodious music ; there was form, and colour, and scent. But whatever may have been the pomp of the Levitical worship, its object was certainly not, to impress the senses of the *nation at large* by an imposing display. The ritual of the Hebrews was confined to a single city of the Holy Land, was performed in one temple alone, and there was but one man only—the High Priest—who was robed in garments of beauty and glory : and which glittered with precious stones. The majority of the people seldom looked upon the exquisite adornments, or took part in the gorgeous ceremonies of the House of the Lord, and even these who, from living in Jerusalem, had constant access to the Temple, never penetrated beyond the outer court, and saw nothing beyond the altar of brass and the laver of brass. The priests alone were allowed to enter the holy place where was the golden candlestick, and the table with its twelve loaves of shew-bread, and the burning incense ; whilst into the inner sanctuary—the Holy of Holies—the High Priest alone was permitted to go, and that only once a year. No eye but his saw the ark of the covenant, the mercy-seat, the Cherubim, the Shechinah, or looked upon the awful ceremony of the sprinkling of the atoning blood. So that the advocates of a sensuous service—a service addressed to the natural senses—find no precedent in the divinely-appointed ceremonial of the Jews.

But again, the Levitical system of Divine worship, which, in some of its aspects, was intended to be a safeguard against idolatry and to imbue the minds of the chosen people with spiritual ideas, was from its nature liable to perversion and superstition. Men turned the symbolism of the law into Pharisaism, substituted the letter for the spirit, bound its precepts on the forehead rather than on the heart ; thought more of the stones of the Temple and of its beauty and splendour, than of Him that dwelt between the cherubim, behind the impenetrable veil ; so that the religious system of the Hebrews “ did not make the comers thereunto perfect.” It was itself imperfect. It was shadow, not substance ; bondage, not freedom ; childhood, not manhood. So it gradually became corrupted ; “ waxed old and was ready to vanish away.” The same Divine hand that reared the Temple, fashioned the sanctuary, and hung the curtain, smote the altar, and laying open the most holy place, rent the veil in twain. He that was greater than the Temple spake its doom in these words :

"The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father." "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

These words institute a contrast between the worship of the Old Testament and the worship of the New. Our Lord does not mean that no true worship had ever been offered to God before, or that He had been satisfied with an unreal service, or that priests, and prophets, and kings, and holy men of old had rested in the letter which killeth, "having the form of godliness and not the power." What God is now He always has been. What the spirituality of His nature requires now it always has required. But the Jewish system placed an emphasis on the sanctity of particular places and persons, upon the obligation of daily, weekly, and yearly sacrifices, and on the forms of an elaborate ceremonial. This was to be laid aside as having served the end for which it was ordained. Henceforth an external ceremonial was not to be interposed between man and God. Man's homage "to the High and Lofty One who inhabiteth eternity" was no longer to be authoritatively united to an elaborate form of service. The true idea of worship, as the faith, the hope, the joy of the soul in God, was to be clearly and fully recognized. "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit,"—not with a worship material, sensuous, rudimentary, and imperfect,—“and in truth;” not with a typical shadowy worship such as that enjoined by the Mosaic law, or with a merely external service.

Now this statement of our Lord, of what Christian worship ought to be, presents us with an argument for the simplicity of Christian Ritual. Nothing appears to me to be more unscriptural than to appeal to any Jewish precedent for the introduction into Christian worship of an imposing ceremonial and an elaborate symbolism. And nothing can be well more unphilosophical; for the Ritual of the earlier dispensation was only a part of a temporary, and national religious system, and did not rest on permanent principles justified by the necessary relations that exist between the soul of Man and "the Father of the spirits of all flesh." And as with the Ritual, so with the Temple. You know that an especial idea of sacredness was attached to that noble and beautiful Temple which was built by the command of God, and whose several parts were constructed after His express directions. Call to mind the way in which it was spoken of by the Jews: It was "the house where His honour dwelleth." The Divine promise to Solomon was this: "I have chosen and sanctified the

house, that My name may be there for ever, and Mine eyes and My heart shall be there perpetually." Thus the nearness of God to His people was strongly asserted by the existence of the one authorized Temple, and His presence with Israel assured by His Divine condescension in accepting a material structure as His dwelling-place. But it is evident that the arrangement was not without its manifest danger. It tended to obscure the spirituality and infinity of the Divine nature. It seemed to localise the Deity. For the more deeply devout men realized God's presence at Jerusalem, the more clearly they felt the absence of Divine consolation and strength when access to the Temple was denied them. Distance from the Temple seemed like banishment from God; and therefore, although the gracious manifestation of the Divine presence in the Temple was almost necessary to the religious thought and life of the Jewish people, the time came when it was expedient that God should no longer be worshipped only at Jerusalem, or be thought of as dwelling in a material sanctuary, but rather be known as a Being whose Temple was the world, and whose shrine was every regenerated heart. I believe it to be antagonistic to the whole spirit of the Christian dispensation to suppose that God is nearer to us in one place than in another, or to think that He confers peculiar sanctity on mere material structures. God's special presence is promised now, not to particular places, but to particular persons. "The Lord's house is his people." It is built of living stones: it is a spiritual habitation for a spiritual inhabitant. "Ye are the Temple of the living God," as God has said, "I will dwell in them, and I will be their God; and they shall be my people." We build houses for the worship of God, but they are not intended to take the place of the Temple; nor are they in any respect like the Temple. No one part of the building is more Holy than another. The consecration of one portion of the edifice belongs to the whole. If, indeed, we regarded the Christian ministry as an office to be exercised by a sacerdotal order of men who as priests should offer sacrifices, and mediate between the people and God, then we ought to have a holy place fenced off with jealous care from the common body of the church, and dedicated as a chancel, or sacrarium, to their special use. If we conceived that Christ was locally, and substantially present under the consecrated elements of bread and wine, we ought to have an altar which, by its material, its position, its shape, should be a perpetual witness to the awful mystery thereon transacted; but the New Testament

condemns such ideas as these; and the Church of England at the Reformation uttered her protest against them, and her martyrs sealed that protest with their blood. Christ Himself is now our only High Priest, and every one of us has direct access to God through Him. His presence is not in consecrated bread; but in regenerated souls. Every believer as a member of His body belongs to a Royal Priesthood, and the promise of Christ assures to us a more sublime form of the Divine presence than that which was conferred by the Shechinah in the old time—"Know ye not that ye are the temple of the Holy Ghost, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" "The Spirit of God and of glory resteth upon you." And for the very reason that the Spirit of God is with us in a sense, and in a measure that He was not with the ancient Church, and that a nearer and truer approach to Him is granted under the present covenant than was granted under the former,—a higher worship is possible to us than to them, and liberated from all that was temporary, and symbolical in the Old dispensation, we glory in a service that is spiritual not sensuous: that we are free to "worship God in spirit and in truth."

It is needful to remember in a day when the spirit which is influencing religious thought is looking back to the past, rather than forward to the future, that there is a higher glory than any which belongs to what is outward and visible. "The king's daughter is all glorious within." Her "apparel" may be "of wrought gold," her "clothing of divers kinds of needlework," but these are far from being her chief ornaments; that which makes her glorious indeed is the faith, the hope, the love which form her meetness for that world where the accidents of worship shall pass away—ceremony and sacrament and symbol—where even the Temple shall disappear,—where we shall "no longer know in part, but know as we are known." Is not the movement a retrograde one which turns from the Gospel to the Law, from "the ministration of the Spirit" to "the ministration of death," which goes back to the shadows, and to the types instead of going forward in the liberty offered by Christ Himself; "the liberty wherewith Christ maketh His people free?"

But I pass on to observe that the very simplicity of Christian worship is a mark of its superiority. You may be inclined to recall, with regret for its loss, the magnificence of Judaism—the splendid vestments; the golden lamps; the ever-burning altar; the pealing music; the awe-struck prostrations; the mysterious shrine; the whole of that elaborate symbolism which has passed away, and indeed

■

to a Jewish mind a religion without priest, without altar, without sacrifice, without temple—whose places of assembly were the rude upper chamber, the bleak mountain side, the barren sea shore, whose most solemn rites involved no acts more imposing than the sprinkling of water, or the breaking of bread, must have appeared poor and uninviting, bald and tame. But the material splendour of the old religion was but an indication of imperfection, and the ceremonial plainness of the new is its true dignity and glory—and for this reason. The Jew needed all the elaborate formality of type and ceremony, of symbolic persons and objects to help out his idea of the Messiah, of His mighty work and mission—for to him Christ was a Being of whose person and character and office he had but the most shadowy and undefined conceptions. But to the Christian, Christ is no vague and visionary Personage of the future—no shadowy dream. He has been “made flesh.” He stands before us with all the distinctness of one with whom we are acquainted; and his words, and deeds, and actions are as familiar to us as those of any dear, well-known earthly friend. Therefore, to bring Him to our remembrance, nothing is needed but what is very simple, the rudest outline—a few drops of water—a bit of broken bread,—a cup of wine.

But again, the simple character of Christian worship is an indication of spiritual advancement. The ritual of Judaism appealed to the senses, the services of Christianity appeal to the understanding. The Jews were in a childhood state and therefore God gave them a system of symbols and exercises suited to their comprehension as babes. But the Christian Church has passed beyond the necessity for this. She no longer needs the picture book and the object lesson.

True it is that the Christian heart demands both outward forms, and rites to embody the reverence, the gratitude, the devotion, the love of which it is inwardly conscious. True, the soul in its relation to an unseen Father still craves for some external medium of utterance that shall give expression to feeling, and translate into outward acts or words its devotion to God. But here nothing has been prescribed by Divine direction, as in Judaism; everything has been left to the direction of the Church. In gracious condescension to our needs the Lord has given us the two Sacraments; but with the fullest liberty with regard to their administration, leaving all details respecting forms and times to be added as the varied requirements of His people in different ages and places and circumstances shall

suggest. The Church in all lands and ages has ever, out of her love and crying necessities, yearned for a channel of communion with her invisible Lord, and she has found expression for her feelings in the acts of Common Prayer. The deep heart of the Church has ever longed to give a voice to its adoration and thankfulness, and so for the outflow of its devotion she has discovered the channel of Common Praise. But the form in which prayer should be made, or praise offered, is left to herself. Our gracious Lord, in His loving wisdom hath prescribed no one necessary form of speech or song,—no one inflexible language of worship for His Church on earth. “Let all things be done decently and in order,” contains the whole of the Divine will on the subject; details are left to the religious instinct and to the sober judgment of the worshipper.

We hear much in the present day of the duty of making our services bright and attractive, and by means of beauty for the eye, and melody for the ear, winning the unspiritual, who will thus be won to the House of Prayer. Well, I can only say, let us give to God our best. Let beauty and strength be still the pillars of His House. There is no holiness in ugliness. There is no spirituality in slovenliness. We are not justified in irreverence because others may be formal and unspiritual. We need not make worship frigid in order to make it devout. The appointments of God’s House should be in harmony with the purpose for which it is used, and for which it is solemnly set apart. Our hymns, instinct with deep devotional feeling, should be rich in poetical expression, and be wedded to music of the richest harmony. But the singing should not be the performance of a choir, but the worship and praise of the congregation. And few abuses in public worship can be more painful to a heart longing to join in the service of God, than that of a whole assembly of professed worshippers remaining silent, while a choir performs for their pleasure. Can this in any sense be called worship at all? And yet, alas! is such a mockery of worship uncommon? Is not the choir too often made a musical stage for the display of the performers, and the House of God turned into a place of entertainment?

If we wish to hear scientific music,—the artistic harmonies of the grand masters of melody,—had we not better resort at once to the concert room or the Oratorio where we go to be sung to and not to sing? Let us remember that when we are in the House of Prayer we are on Holy ground, that we are in the presence of the infinite

and eternal God, who demands that we should worship Him in "spirit and in truth."

We may attract to our churches by architectural adornments, and ritual and ceremony, and musical services, the carnal and the unspiritual, those who would make the unwelcome bondage of the first day of the week, as easy, and as agreeable as possible: those who are not content except the lust of the eye and of the ear be gratified even in the holy place, those who cannot confess themselves to be "miserable sinners" unless they do it to the sound of sweet music. But what have we gained? What have they gained? Has pride been humbled? Has conscience been awakened? Are they any nearer to God when they leave His house than when they came into it? Have we only taught then after all to wrap their cloak of self-deception more closely round them? Have we sent them away self-satisfied because they have mistaken their pleasure in the glory of art and the melody of song for religion, and have been too well content to draw nigh unto God with their lips while the heart is far from Him? True Christian worship,—what is it? Prayer and praise in The Holy Ghost—The Holy Ghost so working in us that our hearts are uplifted to God in homage and adoration. Its true inspiration is derived from Him who teaches us to look up to the all-loving face of our Father in heaven. The harp that you place outside your window to catch the breath of heaven cannot vibrate till the wind sweeps across its strings. The breath may touch it gently so as just to awake the whispering notes; or it may come with the power of the storm, and force it to utter loud sounding notes of music. Still, there must be the breath upon the string before we can have any music whatever. So there must be, before true worship is possible, the breath of the Spirit in the soul. The Holy Ghost must quicken it, whispering in the still small voice, or speaking in louder, or more stirring tones; yet in either case awakening the spirit of prayer, and so enabling us to "worship God in spirit and in truth."

There is no greater danger incident to an elaborate Ritual, than that of mistaking emotion for religious feeling. The music of soft voices, the pealing tones of the organ, the fragrance of incense, the rich light streaming in through the painted window, and throwing a mellow glow over floor, and pillar, and aisle, may thrill the soul with delight, and melt it into tenderness; and these easily excited emotions may be mistaken for religion. Alas! these feelings

have only to do with our bodily organisation and are far removed from a religion of conscience and spiritual conviction. They lead to formalism and self-deception.

The most careless and godless may be moved to tears by the pathos of sweet music, or be held breathless by the touching spell of eloquent words. It is possible to be sentimental without being pious. O, let us beware of mistaking the strange fire kindled by artistic splendour or poetic lustre for that pure and heavenly flame of devotion which is lighted on the altar of the heart by the living Spirit of the living God. "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

We know the desperate struggle that for some time has been made to reintroduce the doctrines and rites of mediævalism into our services. You would think that eternal life and eternal death depended upon Ritual.

But what, I ask, can Ritualism do to compass the end which I suppose it proposes to itself—"the salvation of souls?" What can the carnal weapons which it employs—processions, and banners, and incense, and music, and vestments—effect in the translation of sinners from darkness to light? Was it by such weapons as these that the world was won from Paganism to Christianity? Is it by such weapons that we can vanquish the sin that meets us on all sides, raise the fallen, rescue the tempted, save the perishing, or pluck the guilty as "brands from the burning?" Are not all such questions immeasurably trifling, unspeakably trivial, when we think of the infidelity, and secularism, and vice, and worldliness that meet us on every side, and against which we are called to do battle in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? And may not the mocking devil of lust and hate, and drunkenness, and scepticism, and crime, say in uttermost scorn to all such attempts to exorcise him, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?"

I have sought to speak fairly on this subject. I have had no desire to treat it in the mere spirit of party. We all know too well that there are men in the Church—in her, but not of her—who are seeking to re-introduce into her services forms and ceremonies the reverse of Scriptural—Popish, not Protestant in conception—forms and ceremonies, vestments, and ornaments, which are unbefitting the gravity, and purity, and spirituality of the Christian religion, and which were swept away by the breath of the Reformation, as by a rushing mighty wind. "Christian Worship" is spiritual not sensuous: devotional not dramatic: reasonable not ritualistic. And yet from

practices now common in our churches, you would think it to be the reverse of all these. I give you but one example selected from many. As Good Friday returns year by year we see our risen and ascended Lord treated as though he were dead. The funeral bell is tolled, the church is draped in black, and "the three hours agony" is dramatised. Is this a true representation of the faith of a Christian man? Is this true Christian Worship? Surely not—"Christ being dead dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over Him." Shall we encourage such childish, theatrical, superstitious services, copied as they are from the Roman Church? I say no! I deny that the Crucifix is the proper emblem of the Christian religion. It is a living and not a dead Christ that we worship and adore.

And what is to be the end of all this growth of error in doctrine and in practice in our Church? Are the "broken cisterns" of a false worship to be repaired while the living fountain is forsaken? Is the idol of superstition to be restored to its pedestal, while God is dishonoured and forgotten? Is the rent veil to be suspended afresh between man and the mercy-seat? Is the "new and living way" that has been opened to us to be closed again, and direct access to be forbidden to our Father in heaven? Is any earthly mediator to obtrude himself between us and that Great High Priest, who with love in His heart, and tenderness in His eyes, and urgency in His voice, stands with out-stretched arms ready to receive all to His bosom, crying, "Come unto Me, and I will give you rest." No! I answer, a thousand times "No!" We will not "give subjection, no, not for an hour," to any attempt to rob us of our spiritual freedom. Through God's help we shall take care that the candlestick be not removed, and the lamp be not quenched. We will do all that lies in our power to prevent the story of our Church being read in the history of the seven Churches of Asia now ruined, and roofless, prostrate, deserted, and fallen? It was a saying of Luther's that "the grace of God is like a flying summer shower." Shall the shower pass away from us, and leave us barren, parched, and dry? I am unwilling to think so. I confess, I sometimes fear, but in God is my hope. Still whatever our thoughts on this may be, there is a most solemn duty binding on us as individual Christians and Churchmen, that we should not sanction in any way, or give countenance to that which we believe to be a wrong alike against our Christianity and our Churchmanship.

Yes, and let us as a Church, take heed to the message to the angel of the Church at Sardis: "Be watchful and strengthen the

things which remain that are ready to die, for I have not found thy works perfect before God. Remember, therefore, how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." These words have not a past application only. They come ringing down through the ages, and have a most solemn and urgent voice for us in these latter days, "on whom the end of the world is come." Let us listen to them, and be warned, for "judgment must begin at the House of God." Therefore, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches."

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ISSUES AT STAKE IN
THE LEGAL PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY
THE CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BARDSLEY, M.A.,

RURAL DEAN AND RECTOR OF STEPNEY.

Paper read at the Conference of the Church Association held at
Victoria Rooms, Clifton, on the 25th and 26th October, 1876.

MR. CHAIRMAN, when the Church Association was formed, its founders had no intention of instituting legal proceedings against Clergymen for introducing Romish Vestments, Gestures, Ceremonies, and for teaching Romish doctrines. But when the promoters of the so-called "Catholic Revival," claimed to be the faithful exponents of the Church of England, and charged the Evangelical Clergy with a want of fidelity to their solemn engagements—and when, moreover, the Bishops were obliged to declare that though the Romish innovators set at defiance their godly admonitions yet owing to the uncertainty of the Law, they were unable to put any effectual check to proceedings which were alienating the laity from our Church, the Council of the Church Association decided after the most careful consideration, to adopt measures for ascertaining the legality or otherwise of the practices and doctrines which the Romanizers had introduced. Then those clergymen, who had everywhere proclaimed upon the housetops, that they and they only, fully reflected the spirit and teaching of the Prayer-Book, did all in their power to obstruct and delay legal investigation. And when at length the law was declared, and their practices proved to be illegal, they raised the cry of *Persecution*. Such a cry from such a quarter is truly pitiable. These men have

declared, "Our place is appointed us among Protestants, and in a
 "Communion deeply tainted in its practical system by Protestant
 "heresy; but our duty is the expulsion of the evil, and not flight
 "from it, any more than it is a duty for those to leave the Roman
 "Church, who become conscious also of abuses within her system;"
 and that "our Church is, after all, the English body of Bishops
 "and Priests, providing those who live in England with the grace
 "of the Sacraments; but to call ourselves members of any local
 "Church, and feel bound to adhere to the creed of any local
 "Church, in distinction to that of the Universal Church, is manifestly
 "a mere modernism." And again, they tell us that "*The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament*. . . . holds its anniversary
 "services naturally on Corpus Christi Day. . . . To it we must
 "in the course of time, look for agitating *the restoration of the*
 "*Perpetual Presence*,—at present, unhappily, not provided for in
 "our Church laws,—and *the establishment of a system of Perpetual*
 "*Adoration of that Presence*."—*Union Review* (p. 386). The following
 is also from the *Union Review* (1867), "The work going on in England
 "is an earnest and *carefully organized attempt* on the part of a
 "rapidly increasing body of priests and laymen to bring our
 "Church and country up to the full standard of Catholic faith
 "and practice, and eventually to plead for her union with Rome."
 (p. 412.) "Twenty years hence Catholicism will have so leavened
 "our Church, that she herself, in her corporal capacity, and not
 "a mere small section of her like ourselves will be able to come to
 "you [*i.e.* the Church of Rome] and say, 'Let the hands which
 "political force not spiritual choice . . . have parted these three
 "hundred years be once more joined. We are one with you in
 "faith and we have a common foe to fight.'"—*The Union Review*
 (p. 409).

Some of these "false brethren" as Dean Burgon has recently
 called them, openly state why it would be inexpedient for them to
 leave the Church of England. One of them as cited by the *Union*

Review (p. 410) addressing a Roman Catholic says,—“The English Protestant ‘has no dealings’ with the Romanist. He will not enter your churches; he will not read your books; he is wholly beyond the pale of your influence. Depend upon it, *it is only through the English Church itself that England can be Catholicized*: and to give up our position in it, with all the innumerable opportunities it offers, &c.” Another writes thus;—“The marvel is, that Roman Catholics whatever their views may be, do not see the wisdom of *aiding us* to the utmost. . . . *We are teaching men to believe that God is to be worshipped under the form of bread, and they are learning the lesson from us which they have refused to learn from the Romish teachers that have been among us for the last three hundred years.* We are teaching men to endure willingly the pain of confession which is an intense trial to the reserved Anglo-Saxon nature, and to believe that a man’s ‘I absolve thee’ is the voice of God. On any hypothesis we are doing their work.” The following passage from the *Union Review* needs no comment. “We hope to find some strong force of attraction to draw not only the Protestant to us but both together to you [*i.e.* the Church of Rome] The Catholic party in the Church of England, say we as plainly as words can say it, will be satisfied with nothing short of the restoration of Visible Unity.” (p. 397.) On reading these passages some may perhaps think that they express the opinions and designs of but a few advanced men. I wish from my heart I could find evidence to justify this view of the matter; at the same time, I am most anxious to guard against conveying the impression that I consider all who are associated in this organized attempt to Romanize our Church to be equally guilty. On the other hand, let us not be any longer deceived as to the real nature and extent of this movement. We have not only their own innumerable declarations, of which the passages above cited are fair specimens, but we have the statements of those, who speaking under a sense of deep responsibility, are not likely to

err on the side of exaggeration. We have the dying testimony of the late Archbishop Longley. In the charge intended for delivery to his clergy he declared—"Some of her ministers "think themselves at liberty to hold the doctrines of the Church "of Rome, in relation to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and yet retain "their position within the pale of the Anglican Church, with the "avowed purpose of eliminating from its formularies every trace "of the Reformation, as regards its protest against Romish error. . . "It is no want of charity, therefore, to declare that they remain "with us in order that they may substitute the Mass for the Com- "munion; the obvious aim of our Reformers having been to substi- "tute the Communion for the Mass."

The present Archbishops of Canterbury and York have expressed their conviction that there is "a considerable minority both of "clergy and laity amongst us desiring to subvert the principles of "the Reformation;" and they "appeal to all reasonable men to "consider whether the very existence of our National Institutions "for the maintenance of religion is not imperilled thereby." Under these circumstances is it possible that even the most credulous of Englishmen can be imposed upon by the cry of *Persecution*? That men—to use the words of Dean Burgon, "whose watchwords are "disloyalty to their Church; disobedience to their Bishops; defiance "of their country's laws;" who will be satisfied with no Court but the one "wherein they themselves should be exclusively the "defendants, and the counsels, and the law-makers, and the "judges"—should raise the cry of *Persecution* is adding insult to injury. They were admitted to the ministry of the Protestant Reformed Church of England, on making the most solemn declarations, that they would teach her doctrines and conform to her practice; and yet they have openly avowed it to be their intention to subvert her principles, and betray the trust that they have received; and they raise the cry of *Persecution*, because they are not allowed without let or hindrance, to carry out their

designs. I will conclude this part of my address with the following weighty words of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, uttered at a Diocesan Conference held at Wells, in October last. "Persecution is, indeed a vile and odious thing, equally unworthy of a free State, or of a Pure Church, but to bring in the aid of the law to prevent an authorized expounder of the Church's doctrine, one invested with power, to speak in the Church's name, from using that power for the overthrowing of the Church's doctrine, this surely is not Persecution but justice in her simplest form. No community, however free from State control can allow its ministers to give the lie to its own doctrines which they are employed to propagate: much less can a National Church, endowed with large revenues, and set in place of power and dignity, allow those who share in these advantages to contradict her teaching, and act in opposition to her laws. The firm repression of all such acts is not persecution, but vindication of truth and law, without which no community can exist."—*Times*, 14th October, 1875. The Council of the Church Association, in all its legal proceedings, has aimed at accomplishing the object which is declared to be just and necessary, in the passage just read from the address of the Bishop of Bath and Wells. The issues raised are of paramount importance, viz.—whether clergymen who are under the most solemn vows and engagements to teach the doctrines of our thirty-nine Articles, are to be allowed to indoctrinate our people with the novel and unscriptural Articles of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.? Whether men shall be permitted to set up the Mass in our churches, who have subscribed that the "sacrifices of masses, in the which it is commonly said, that the priest did offer up Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceit?" Whether men shall be allowed to restore our churches and ritual after the mediæval pattern in the face of the distinct declarations of our Prayer Book, that ceremonies had so increased before the "Reformation," that "the burden of them was intolerable;" and that whilst

Those were retained which were consistent with "a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the spirit," and that the great excess and multitude of them, had been "abolished," as calculated to foster "superstition?" Whether the ministers of a Church, which teaches that there are two "Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel," and that "Penance is one of those five commonly called Sacraments which are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel," shall be allowed to teach that Sacramental Confession is the "authorized channel through which absolving grace flows," and that any other way is "extramedial, exceptional, and abnormal?" Whether, when our Church has emphatically declared, that "it is most evident and plain that this Auricular Confession hath not his warrant of God," and that "it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it has been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance,"—clergymen shall be allowed to set up confessional boxes, and teach their people that "it is to the priest, and to the priest only, that a child must acknowledge his sins, if he desires that God should forgive him," and that by absolution rightly received, they "are pure and spotless as on the day when they were baptized?" These are among the issues raised, and I ask are they not of vital importance?

Whether we have regard to the ceremonies and vestments which have been made the foundation of legal proceedings, as in the suits against Mr. Mackonochie and Mr. Purchas, or to the doctrines as in the case of Mr. Bennett, we shall find that the whole system is founded upon erroneous and unscriptural views of the office and work of the Christian minister.* It is held that participation of the body and blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual; and that this is only conveyed to individual Christians by the hands of the successors of the apostles and their delegates. Thus, it will be seen that to all intents and purposes, this teaching represents us as entirely dependent

upon the priesthood for saving grace; and to make the subjugation of the laity complete, the habitual practice of private confession to a priest is enforced as a preparation for the reception of the Lord's Supper. As Dean Burgon says, "It is *the Romish Sacrament* of Penance which these men are trying to bring back among us, in defiance of the Church: a debasing, a demoralizing system, which will bear none but most bitter fruit." According to Romish teaching no one can be admitted to the Lord's Supper who does not at least once in the year make private confession to a priest. That it is the Romish Sacrament of Penance which these men are seeking to restore has been made abundantly evident. A few years ago, 480 clergymen memorialized the Upper House of Convocation, to "consider the advisability of providing for the education, selection, and licensing of duly qualified Confessors, in accordance with the provisions of Canon law." There are Ritualistic writers without end who tell us that the absolution of the priest is a *judicial act*; one writer, the Author of *The Priest in Absolution*, affirms that in the Confessional "*the priest is judge in the place of God.*" I do not say that I know of any case in our Church, where a Romanizing clergyman has declined to administer the Lord's Supper to one refusing to confess; yet I cannot suppose Dean Burgon would have penned the following words, if he had not had good reason for supposing that something of the kind had been attempted. Alluding to the words in the "Visitation of the Sick," he says:—"But will anyone pretend that this constitutes any ground whatever why a man (generally a young and incompetent one) should molest a dying person who evidently desires to depart in peace, with proposals for confession? worse yet, that such an one should dare to withhold, or even to threaten to withhold, the sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood from the dying, in default of the other's compliance with his own wholly unauthorized solicitations?" And again he says, "To refuse confirmation certificates to children who do not 'confess,'

"is nothing else but a flagrant abuse of trust; an act of immorality which ought to be punishable by law." How thankful we ought to be for such plain outspoken words from one who has for so many years ranked so high among the clergy of the old High Church school.

I have dwelt longer upon these points than I had intended, but the great importance attaching to them will, I trust, be accepted as my apology.

I need hardly remind you that by means of the legal proceedings instituted by the friends of the Church Association, many Romish ceremonies have been pronounced unlawful. The elevation of the consecrated elements; the minister kneeling or prostrating himself before the consecrated elements; the using of lighted candles during the celebration of the Holy Communion, when such candles were not needed for giving light; using incense, and mixing water with wine during the celebration of the Communion. The using of albs, tippets, coloured stoles, dalmatics, maniples, and the chasuble; wafer bread, kissing the Gospel Book, and standing in front of the Holy Table with back to the people during the Prayer of Consecration. These, and other practices of a cognate character, have been authoritatively condemned. As I have before intimated, all these ceremonies and vestments derive their significance from the relation which they bear to the office and work of the minister; they are symbolical of the awful and tremendous powers with which the priest is declared to be invested. I will touch briefly upon two things:—

The authority and powers claimed by these Romanizing priests' and secondly, upon

The use of vestments and ceremonies to symbolize these powers.

1. On the powers claimed, weigh the following declarations:—
 "The priest at the altar is virtually Christ himself."—*Catechism of Theology*, p. 58. "His office (the priest's), and the reverence due, depend entirely on that cardinal doctrine of the earthly priest-

“hood as the divinely appointed channel through which the omnipotent power of the sinless High Priest in heaven is conveyed to the ordinances of the Church, and through them applied to the souls of his members.”—*The Ministry of Consolation*, p. 56, being “A Guide to Confession.” The passage which I next cite is I think, most awful; I am afraid to characterize it, but this is done for us in our thirty-first Article:—“Here I see a most precious victim; a victim obedient to the will of God; and what is more wondrous still, obedient to the will of the creature, who causes Him to be present on the Sacred Altar, whenever the Holy Mystery is celebrated; and who without any let or hindrance from the Divine Victim, offers Him up to the remembrance of the *Eternal Father* as often as he wills, and with whatever intention he pleases.” This passage occurs in a manual by Orby Shipley, entitled *The Daily Sacrifice*, pp. 179-180.

SYMBOLICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF VESTMENTS.

The vestments and the numerous ceremonies which were condemned in the Mackonochie and Purchas Judgments, were used to symbolize the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and of the offering them up to the Father by the priest as a propitiatory sacrifice, both for the living and the dead. Here again we had better let the leaders of the Romanizing party speak for themselves. In an essay on *Some Results of the Tractarian Movement*, by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, we read:—“The ancient vestments present to crowds of worshippers the fact that here, before God's altar, is something far higher, far more awful, more mysterious, than aught that men speak of, namely the presence of the Son of God in human flesh subsisting;” and in his evidence given before the Royal Ritual Commission, he distinctly declared, that the chasuble and other vestments involved, “the real objective presence of our Blessed Lord, the sacrifice offered

“by the priest and the adoration due to the presence of our Blessed Lord.”

As Mr. Bennett is the only clergyman who has been prosecuted by the friends of the Church Association in respect of doctrine, I trust a few remarks on his case will not be considered out of place. A superficial view of the Bennett judgment has led some to affirm that the particular doctrine of the Romish Church which the Church of England has especially condemned, may now under the highest legal sanction be openly preached in our churches. This is an entire mistake. It is quite true that Mr. Bennett, though strongly censured, was not condemned by the Court. But then it should always be remembered that the Court was obliged to found its judgment exclusively upon the passages which had been cited from his works. The statements made before the Ritual Commission, and a still more important passage on the body and blood of Christ being received by the wicked unfortunately were not before the Court. The judges did not condemn Mr. Bennett, because to the majority of them it had not been clearly proved that he held the doctrine imputed to him; it is therefore not correct to say that *legal* sanction was given by the Court to the doctrine, when the Court distinctly affirmed, both directly and indirectly, that had the accused been proved to hold the doctrine he was charged with teaching they must have condemned him. They intimate that if Mr. Bennett had “expressly” taught that there was any presence other than spiritual, he must have been condemned. They also say that, “It is not lawful for a clergyman to teach that ‘the sacrifice or offering of Christ upon the cross, or the redemption, propitiation, or satisfaction, wrought by it, is or can be repeated in ‘the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper; nor that in that ordinance ‘there is or can be any sacrifice or offering of Christ, which is ‘efficacious in the sense in which Christ’s death is efficacious, to ‘procure the remission of the guilt or punishment of sin.’” Equally distinct is the declaration of the judges, on the point of adoration, viz., that the Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration

either to the consecrated elements, or to any corporal presence of Christ therein.

On reading the following passages:—"This charge is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings may require;—"their Lordships will give him the benefit of the doubt which has been raised;"—"the Committee" will "construe in his favour every reasonable doubt;" we may think their charity was stretched beyond all reasonable bounds in order to bring in a verdict of "Not proven;" but it seems to me that the English Church is no more justly chargeable with sanctioning *heresy*, through the acquittal of Mr. Bennett, than English jurisprudence is chargeable with sanctioning theft by the acquittal of a strongly suspected thief who escapes conviction because the evidence is deemed insufficient to prove him guilty. The utmost that can be said, as to the Court's decision being favourable to the Ritualists is expressed in the language imputed to a very prominent clerical member of the Ritualistic party, viz., that the doctrine taught by Mr. Bennett is henceforth in the Church of England, "but tolerated heresy." And indeed it is only "tolerated heresy," so long as men contrive, as Mr. Bennett, to use language which will insinuate the poisonous error against which our Church protests, and yet be capable of being "construed so as not to be plainly repugnant," to her formularies; and so oblige a majority of the Court to come "to the conclusion that the charge is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require." There is much in the Judgment which Evangelical Churchman must regard with devout thankfulness to Almighty God. The plain and forcible exposition which it contains of the teaching of our Church on the Lord's Supper, has abundantly vindicated the claim of Evangelical Churchmen to be her loyal and faithful sons; and has at the same time clearly demonstrated the fact that such advanced Ritualists as Mr. Bennett cannot *consistently* minister within the pale of the Church of England.

SYMBOLICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MINISTER CONSECRATING THE
ELEMENTS WITH HIS BACK TO THE PEOPLE.

There is great force in the words of Dean Burgon that the vehemence with which this is insisted upon by those who practise it "shows that they regard it as a very important act indeed, but which "certainly has been unknown to our Church for full 300 years."

On the following points there is no room for controversy.

- (a) That before the Reformation, when the priest, in the Lord's Supper, was supposed to offer up a propitiatory sacrifice, the Eastward Position was the *universal practice*.
- (b) That at the Reformation, when *the Communion* was substituted for *the sacrifice of the Mass*, the Eastward Position was as universally abandoned, and the North side position adopted in its stead.
- (c) That writers of accepted authority in our Church, both from the days of the Reformation to the final revision of the Prayer Book in 1662, and since 1662 to within the last thirty years, have uniformly declared that the Eastward Position was deliberately rejected by our Church as a practice identified with the false doctrine of the Church of Rome.
- (d) That the Romanizing Party in reviving this practice have distinctly stated that they adopt it because it is the position of a sacrificing priest.

These are facts and not matters of opinion only. They are plain historical facts which admit of the most complete demonstration. Time forbids my quoting at length the authorities to establish these positions, but with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will just indicate some of the links of the long chain of evidence by which they can be fully proved.

In regard to the first and second positions, I may refer to the change of the rubric in 1552, to the comment on this rubric by Bishop Cosin—the challenge, in the early part of Elizabeth's reign,

given by Bishop Jewel to the Romanists to justify the Eastward Position, and speaking of it as one of the superstitions connected with the Mass—to the frank acknowledgment of Mr. Scudamore, a staunch defender of the Eastward Position,—that the North-side Position was adopted by our Reformers in its stead for the express purpose of getting rid of the “memory of the idolatrous Mass.”

In support of the third position, I may remind you that when Archbishop Laud, Bishops Wren and Cosin, were accused of attempting to revive the practice of the minister consecrating with his back to the people, the accusers spoke of it as a superstitious and unlawful act; whilst the answers made by the accused show that not one of them pleaded that our Church gave any countenance to the practice.

Only three years before the Prayer Book was revised, viz. in 1659, L'Estrange, in his *Alliance of Divine Offices*, wrote thus: “As for the priest’s standing at the North side of the Table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest’s standing with his face towards the East, as is the Popish practice. So the MS. collections of a learned man.”

In 1674, only twelve years after the final revision of the Prayer Book a popular Catechism, compiled from the writings of our best Church of England divines, contains the following question and answer. “Q. Why doth the priest stand on the North side of the Table? A. To avoid the Popish superstition of standing towards the East.” Nicholls and Wheatley wrote their Commentaries on the Prayer Book in 1710; Archdeacon Yardley wrote his book on some of the offices of the Prayer Book in 1728; Bishop Mant wrote his Commentary on the Prayer Book in 1824; Professor Blunt wrote his book on *The Duties of the Parish Priest*, in 1856; and with the history and wording of the rubrics under consideration, they one and all declared, that our Church rejected the Eastward Position as one bound up with the false doctrine of the Mass; they all in effect say,—in the words of Archdeacon Yardley:—“He (the

“minister of the Church of England) doth not stand before the altar
 “as the Romish priests do; nor like them pronounce the words
 “with a low voice, to countenance their pretended miracle of tran-
 “substantiation. . . . But the priest in the Church of England
 “says the prayer with an audible voice . . . and stands so as
 “he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread
 “before the people, and take the cup into his hands.”

In proof of the fourth position, viz., that the Romanizing party, practise it because it is the position of a sacrificing priest, I need only remind you that this has been distinctly declared in various Ritualistic publications, such as *The Ritual Reason Why*; the *Catechism on the Office of the Holy Communion*; by Dr. Pusey, Rev. A. Tooth, Mr. Beresford Hope, the Rev. Morton Shaw, and numerous other writers. Though all these insist upon the Eastward Position, they do not go to equal lengths in upholding the essentially Romish doctrine of the Mass; nevertheless they all agree in defending the position as one possessing *doctrinal significance*.

When we consider that the four positions to which I have referred are simple and incontrovertible facts, it is impossible to consent to the position of the minister at the Lord's Table being treated as an open question. It is one thing for a clergyman to hold a certain doctrine on the Lord's Supper, but it is quite another that he should be at liberty to enforce it by ritual in his church; in the forcible words of Dean Howson, in his unanswerable book,—*Before the Table*,—"If all doctrinal opinions had a right to ceremonial expression, we should be in danger of ecclesiastical dissolution." There is a great difference between holding some doctrinal opinions, and giving expression to them by outward ceremonies. In the Bennett Judgment, the Court on this point speaks thus:—"In the public or
 “common prayers and devotional offices of the Church all her
 “members are expected and entitled to join; it is necessary, there-
 “fore, that such forms of worship as are prescribed by authority for
 “general use should embody those beliefs only which are assumed to

"be generally held by members of the Church." One would think this sentiment would be accepted by all sincere and loyal Churchmen.

There is danger lest we be led astray on this important matter by what are called the moderate and wise counsels of men filling high places in our Church. In the early part of last year the following resolution was moved by the Bishop of Carlisle in the Convocation of the Province of York:—"And whereas undue importance has been by some attributed to the position of the priest in saying the Prayer of Consecration, as though that position had some peculiar doctrinal significance, it is hereby declared that no peculiar Doctrinal Significance ought to be or is intended by the Church of England to be attributed to such position."

The Bishop of Manchester in opposing it, characterized this resolution as both superfluous and dangerous. I believe it to be most dangerous. Can the Bishop of Carlisle imagine, that a ceremony which was rejected more than 300 years ago by our Church, for the express purpose—to use the words of Mr. Scudamore, a zealous defender of the Eastward Position—of showing "abhorrence of sacrifices of masses," and from "a desire to obliterate them from the minds of the people," and which ever since has been associated in the minds of all English Protestants with that doctrine of the Church of Rome which they regard with special detestation, I ask, can the Bishop seriously suppose that by framing such a declaration as the above, the Eastward Position can be divested of that doctrinal significance which long use and custom have imparted to it? In my humble opinion, it is anything but a good omen, that we have reached a crisis in the Ritualistic movement when a proposal embodying so perilous a compromise could find favour with a majority of the members of the northern Province of Convocation. The fact that a Sacrificing Priesthood underlies this question necessitates on the part of all sound Protestant Churchmen uncompromising opposition to the Eastward Position. We gladly admit that in our National Church there is, and ought to be, room for considerable diversity of

opinion; but when the issue raised is between the Lord's Supper and the doctrine of the Mass, between a Scriptural Ministry and a Sacrificing Priesthood, there *can be no place for compromise*. This error touches the very core of divine truth, because it involves a *practical denial* of the all-sufficiency of the one offering made by Christ on the cross of Calvary; it places an earthly priest between Christ and the soul of a penitent believer, as if he had not direct access to the cleansing fountain for sin and uncleanness, without the intervention of a sacrificing priest. Whilst possessing every desire to retain for our Church that comprehensive character which was designed by the framers of our Prayer Book, we ought to give our united, determined and uncompromising opposition to all attempts to legalize either sacrificial vestments or the Romish position of the minister, inasmuch as it is thereby openly asserted that it is lawful for a clergyman of the Church of England to teach that in the Lord's Supper, our adorable Saviour's body and blood become truly present on a human altar, in virtue of the consecrating act of an earthly priest, and are offered by him to God the Father as a Propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.

MR. CHAIRMAN and Protestant friends, the issue raised by the *legal proceedings* instituted by the Church Association is plainly this—Shall the Romanizers—who though within our Church are not of it,—be permitted to use their opportunities to undo the work of the Reformation? This is the real issue raised; and I trust that this Association which by God's blessing has done so much valuable service in the past, will continue to prosecute its labours with charity, wisdom, zeal, and fidelity, until the scandal is removed from our beloved Church of some of her clergy being allowed to teach those doctrines of the Church of Rome, for the rejecting of which the Reformers were burnt at the stake; speak of the Reformation, and the very word "Protestant" with ridicule and contempt; when at the same time, the Sovereign of these realms is required to take an oath administered by the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of our Church and nation to "maintain the laws of God, the true "principles of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion "established by law."

SPECIAL MISSIONS AND SERVICES; THEIR ADVANTAGES AND DANGERS.

BY THE REV. JOHN RICHARDSON, M.A.,
INCUMBENT OF CAMDEN CHURCH, CAMBERWELL.

Paper read at the Conference of the Church Association, held at
Victoria Rooms, Clifton, on the 25th and 26th October, 1876.

IN dealing with any work which professes to be for God, we should be conscious of a desire to find it genuine and good. The attendant partiality, which springs out of a desire for God's glory, will not however in this case weaken the judgment which we honestly do our best to form. If there be a movement for good, the Christian will desire to be in the very front, to join it, guide it, head it, out of very love for the Master and zeal for the cause. But in an age of excitement a wise man wishes to be calm; and when many novelties are submitted for a man's acceptance, the prudent will cautiously ask whether the new thing is the true thing, whether what is easily begun may be expected to last, and to forward the purpose which a godly man has at heart. When we, therefore, discuss the subject of Special Missions, it should be as if we handled a work which we shall be glad to find good rather than evil. Whether this be the right thing to be done, something ought to be devised and done to remedy the state of coldness in the Church and deadness in the world, which all true Christians must deplore. Some no doubt may be carried away by a movement which may be only as the passing torrent in a thunderstorm. Yet it is something at least, if the air be cleared and the water fills the channels even for a season, and if we are cast aside in useless inactivity, prophesying evil, murmuring and grumbling at the new efforts of abler and better men, we shall suffer, and not the cause, which God can bless without us.

Now an obvious advantage in a Mission is the public and persistent attention which it calls to the cause and claims of God. No man can thoughtfully consider the state of thought and feeling in this day, without a painful conviction that God is practically ignored and neglected by multitudes who do not go so far as to deny His

existence, or declare themselves against His claims. Within the Churches is the paralysis of routine; without the Churches is the prostration of ignorant indifference and neglect. And a Mission is a challenge and a call for God. One great subject for a season fills the air. Some men are angry, some scornful, some bitterly opposed, some startled and surprised; but men are made to think who have refused even to consider. And this is a great gain. Religion is talked about in the workshop. The question whether a man shall or shall not attend the services is discussed at home. Men canvass with one another what all the movement means; and in the mental commotion, the great subject of God, and eternity, and the soul, and Christ's offer of salvation, will not be stirred in vain.

Now, in a hopeful Mission there must be very much more of God than of man. The leaders, movers, organizers, ought to be conscious of a real desire to keep self out of sight, that God may be all in all. It is of the very first importance that the whole community shall be startled, challenged, alarmed by a solemn remembrance made of God. The great question of religion should be so lifted up, out of the region of conventionality, out of the hiding places of fear or false shame, that it grapples with every man's conscience, raises its head over the daily concerns of each man's ordinary life, and demands a hearing for God and for His truth.

And another prominent feature must be prayer. There is something solemnizing in the thought that many men are praying,—praying for us,—pleading before God for blessings on our souls. The careless must be made to know this, to feel this, to have this fact presented in its calm and convincing reality. Why are so many meeting together, the ungodly masses should be drawn to say,—What are they wanting, to whom are they speaking, for what are they waiting? They are pleading for your conversion. They are asking God to soften your hard hearts. They are going to Him who can do, to get that which they cannot do—to get grace and power to change and comfort you. This should be the language which comments upon the fact that their godly neighbours are on their knees. These quiet worshippings will have a voice in heaven and a voice on earth too, and it is always an advantage to have a man's prayers; but when many Christian men come together, and have only one great petition which they put up in fervour of faith and importunity of love, and that for others and not for themselves, the profit, the power, the prevalency must be great. Not in foolish parade, and yet in plain and open acknowledgment that they are on their knees before God, the believing people of God must put prayer in very prominent place when any special mission or service is organised and carried out for the good of the souls of men.

And here it must be kept in mind, that a Mission must never be associated with the interests of a party or a denomination. Multitudes of men have become impressed with the idea that religion, in

some way, is to benefit those who recommend it. They impute motives, and however mistaken they may have been, the contentions amongst brethren have grievously hindered gospel work. This element of strife must be, if possible, put aside. If it be only a crusade for Churches, and not for Christ, it will be a forceless, faulty thing.

A Mission begins lower than Church organisations. The question of the truth to be maintained will come up for our consideration by-and-by; but assuming men to be at one upon the great and essential verities of salvation work, it is a misfortune when their mission work does not go on together. Church Missions now, dissenting missions at a subsequent time—such things may become a necessity; but it is a painful one which is to be avoided, if possible, by any community in which special attempts are to be made to bring the outcast into the fold of Christ. Let all God's servants in a locality work at once, and give it to be very distinctly understood and appreciated, that they are putting denominational interests in subordination to a united effort to add to the Church of Christ, such as the Lord may gather in through grace.

Another great advantage from a Mission is the distinct treatment with which it handles sin. There is often only a generality of statement under which the enormity of rebellion against God is not brought out. There are habits of society, of sentiment, of seeming necessity in times and places, under which particular sins are winked at, tampered with, explained away. The habit of the place, its trade, its traditional character, has lowered the tone with which even true men speak of transgression. Some bold servants of the Lord come from breathing purer air. They have felt nothing of the deceptive delicacy which may have chosen smoother words. They tell out a plain story, and tear away without knowing it, the covering which had gathered round popular or profitable evil. And it is a great advantage when the probe goes deep into the conscience, and sinners feel that their sin has found them out. Be very tender with the sinner; but be very truthful about his sin; this is what a special mission requires and enables honest and loving men to be.

Another great advantage in a Mission is the distinct and reiterated utterance it makes of a free and full salvation to be had from the Lord Jesus Christ. It has often happened with careless men, that they protect conscience by an idea that salvation means something less to the bulk than it does to the favored of mankind. They have rejected Christ, and come to think that Christ has rejected or at least passed over them. Now the story of His love—the plain positive offers of His pardon and forgiveness of sins—the personal appeal made in His name to men who know themselves to be sunk in vice and hopelessness—this is a glorious thing to tell in the ears of any brother man. And the work of a Mission, though it finds many occasions for bracing up and brightening the faith and love of those

who already believe in Jesus, should deal first and most with the case of the unconverted who are to be won, by God's grace, to Christ. It is greatly to be feared that the very idea of the Saviour has been lowered and distorted in this our day. Some seem to regard Him only as a man whose kind offices may be dispensed with in the hard stern struggle of these later days. Some have come to think of Him as a teacher; but with a system too strict, and opinions too sanguine, and claims too exalted, for the matter-of-fact interests of a day like ours. And the Mission is to exalt the Lord Jesus—to tell of His glory, who has said "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."—to tell of His beauty, in whose presence angels veil their faces, and the saints cast down their crowns.

The idea of the pictorial Christ with His wounds and His agonies, and His weakness—the idea of the traditional Christ, veiled under Sacraments, hidden amongst the crude conceptions of our childhood, more of a myth than a person; more of a centre to which opinions cohere, than a living, loving Saviour out of whom sympathy and saving grace have come—this idea must be rooted out and cleared away. And the Christ of Heaven, the Christ of the coming kingdom and glory, the Christ who hath power on earth to forgive sins—the Christ with whose person and glory the word of God is full—this real Christ must be set forward that men may admire Him and adore. A Mission is worse than nothing if it do not glorify Jesus; for it is only an excitement without reasonable excuse or right direction. But it is a great advantage when true men, who have mastered the grand idea, shall stand in the presence of multitudes and tell, from the earnestness of conviction, and with the eloquence of a personal knowledge, how great, how gracious, how true, how willing, how able, that Saviour is "who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him." In all the marked features of a Mission this must be most conspicuous, that the Lord Jesus Christ has the foremost place—lifted up above preachers and hearers—set forth in person, in work, in power, so that the first impression and the last made on every mind at every service, shall be that the Christian's theme, the Christian's help, the Christian's hope, the Christian's happiness, centres in, and gathers round the Lord Jesus Christ. "For this is the record that God hath given unto us eternal life, and that life is in His Son." And here let me mention a matter which seems to have clouded thought in reference to the controversies of our day—the misuse of terms which describe Church parties, as we are compelled to call them. Men speak of *high Church*, as if the stress was on the degree of height, and as if the converse was what is called the *low Church*. From this has branched the idea of broad or slow or dry, as if the question turned upon an adjective the qualifying measure of attention given. The real distinction is to be brought out by emphasis on the other word. It is *high Church*, and not *high Church*. Then the converse will be *high Christ*. One man goes to the Church to find Christ; the other goes to Christ to find the Church. Regarding the Church, the so-

called Evangelical does not admit that he is low. He looks at the real rather than the apparent, and so in fact claims to be high in his estimate as to what *the Church* is. But with him Christ is higher than Church; and his averment is that he is not so much a high Churchman as a high Christ man.

I shall point but to one advantage more, which belongs to ■ Mission, wisely, earnestly, thoroughly worked out. It is the conviction that it creates that in work upon human souls every individual believer must take his part. Few things have more chilled and crippled human effort than the undue exaltation of the ministry in the Church. I pause not to apportion the blame amongst those who have brought about this strange and unjustifiable state of things. But the fact is too apparent on every side. The proclamation of Christ—the concern for the spiritual welfare of mankind—have quietly settled down to be the matter for which one order of men has been left chiefly to care. The result has been the pride of human authority—and the pressure of overburdened responsibility—on the side of the ministers of religion; with a consequent suspicion or want of interest, on the part of the body of believing people. The burden must be readjusted, and the labour of love rearranged: and the fact must be asserted and insisted on, that the body is not one member and no one can say to another “I have no need of thee.” And a Mission brings out this great fact. Christian workers are busy in dealing with careless men. Praying people are pleading before God for His blessing. And Christians, who know and love Christ, have heart and thought and conscience all drawn out, when anxious sinners are inquiring “What must I do to be saved?”

Yes, there are advantages, many, large, lasting advantages, when a Mission is prayerfully, wisely, scripturally attempted, in God’s name, by God’s grace, and for God’s glory. The thing has indeed passed out of the region of conjecture and experiment, into the domain of fact and ascertained result. And many a Christian brother could rise here and say that he has found it good for his own soul, good for the souls of his people, good for the believer, good for the unbeliever also, that a Mission, or Special Service, call it by what name you may choose, was set on foot in his town or parish or sphere of work for Christ.

But are there any dangers? Now, any Christian work may be represented as surrounded by things out of which evil and not good may come. Christian workers are prepared for that, accustomed to that, for nothing is too sacred for unbelief and suspicion not to cast a stone at it. But, dangers in the path of duty never deter the wise and the brave, who take up their cross and follow Christ. Yet, the Lord’s people are not to be unwisely impetuous and unreasoningly rash. The dangers may be so serious as to make a true man hesitate to be identified with this particular mode of saving souls and serving God, or they may be so superficial, so on the movement

as not to be of it, that the question simply rises, how best to eliminate the mischievous and yet hold to the system that practically may be turned to good account.

There is a danger which has to do with doctrine. Lovers of truth, and labourers for souls, must never be drawn aside to disparage dogma. Christianity is only what it is, because of the saving truth it teaches and insists upon. And this is specially to be kept in mind in this day, because of the position of things with which we have to deal. The minds of many men have been unsettled, startled, shocked by certain new opinions which have come to their ears in these latter times. Sometimes, these opinions came so far short of the Gospel truth, that to be content with them is to be betrayers and abandoners of it. And sometimes, they have gone so beyond the Gospel truth, that advanced men practically have left the good old paths almost entirely out of sight. And Christian men are anxiously looking to the Christian ministers who are considered sound and steadfast in the faith, to be delivered and directed in a time of their great distress. And they are saddened when they see trusted men in company with other men who are not trusted; and danger arises lest the old friends lose their attachment, while the new friends are really not one with those who love the truth. Take the case of a Socinian, who denies the proper deity of Christ, who expunges or explains away the doctrine of atonement, and of substitution, in the matter of a sinner's justification before God. Is it not a grievous peril to seem in any way to be allied in teaching with a man of such opinions? Or take the case in an opposite direction.

A man is known for his ritualistic tendencies in worship and his sacerdotal claims in ministry and for his sacramental limitations concerning the soul's birth or the soul's sustentation. In the public worship—in doctrinal utterances on the very primary and saving truths two men are notoriously, conspicuously, confessedly, far apart. Surely there is danger, grievous apprehension of mischief, when men so different are joined together in some great religious movement. Either there is the danger of an opinion that both are right, and therefore distinctive truth in these matters of the soul is neither important nor possible; or there is the danger of the idea that both are wrong, or at least neither is very confident or very sincere. Externally there is, to my mind, the very utmost peril in so conducting a Mission as to seemingly unite men in it, who are and must be, when they speak their whole mind and heart, essentially and confessedly estranged. But the internal danger is more conspicuous still. Men are not saved by error; and after you have startled sinners out of their slumber, and terrified them into an attempted escape from the wrath to come, what is the profit if you open a false way and urge them to flee in a direction where neither pardon nor peace can be found? You may bring a man to the feet of a confessor, and yet not lead him to Christ. You may introduce a man to a worship of form and ceremonial, and yet

not teach him to worship the Father in spirit and in truth. You may persuade a man to partake of a Sacrament, and yet not fit him to feed in his soul on the bread of life. You may rouse sinners, and the devil may snare them. You may drive men before you like sheep and yet never bring them, by the one only door, into the fold of the Good Shepherd. But this danger is not of the essence but only of the organization of a Mission. Missions have been conducted, and can be conducted, so as to make the distinction apparent between the men who are working in the same time in one place. There need be no intermixture; and that there shall be none must be and will be the determination of all decided men. Much can be said in favour of a man who purposely conducts a Mission when others are doing so, from a desire to protect his own people from the temptation of attending where he believes they may hear harmful things. Only, there is danger in this direction which wise and loyal men will not be unwilling to have pointed out.

Before any seeming union, there must be a plain distinction between those who differ, not merely on non-essential and external things, but on the very foundation questions, on matters concerning which, as honest men, we must be determined that, so far as we can hinder it, no man shall be led astray. It is useless to deny that men are working in our Church with whom we cannot co-operate.

If it be only a matter of discipline, a question of Church government—a thing of names and parties—rise to the nobler consideration of sinners perishing for lack of knowledge; and go out together into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring the blind, and the maimed, and the halt, that the wedding may be furnished with guests. Only get men within the banqueting house, where the Master meets his guests, and there will be food for all, and no questions will be asked as to who brought the starvelings in.

But if it be matter of truth, you have no right to tamper with that. It is your Master's, and not yours; and you were sent out on His errand and with His message. Make no concessions to error; and attempt no compromise about truth. You may be called uncharitable, unsympathetic, uncourteous, for you will seem to cast reflection upon earnest men. Be not daunted or drawn aside by that. "If we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel," we are verily guilty before God of corrupting the coin of the kingdom, and deteriorating the bread of the soul. At all cost, under any pressure, never do that. In the matter of truth be firm, be staunch, be true.

There are other minor dangers which may be avoided by care and by free co-operation amongst Christian men. There is, for instance, the danger of repeated excitement. In every system mere excitement develops weakness and not strength. And mere religious excitement often ends in an increase of the carelessness which it was

meant to remove. A Mission is good for a beginning, but it must not be depended on for a continuance of work for Christ. The age of Miracles was confined to the period when evidences were needed that the gospel came from God. Miracles even, if repeated, would have ceased to excite wonder, or secure attention, or beget faith. Follow up the time of Mission excitement, by quiet, continuous, persistent, prayerful work; and with God's blessing results will follow amongst workers and souls for which they labour, for which the Church of Christ may well thank God.

But there is one danger to which I am anxious especially to point attention—and that is, the danger of getting up a Mission as if the work of converting souls is to be the result of the work of man. Our Heavenly Father has been graciously pleased to act upon men through the ministry and instrumentality of other men. But He is sovereign after all. No machinery will do the work, apart from or independently of the presence and power of the Holy Ghost. And so, in the matter of organization, in the selection of missionary agency, in the whole scope and system of a Mission, see that man keeps his proper position of subordination, and secure wide, free action to be taken in the Lord's own time, and the Lord's own way, so that all may be seen and said to be of grace and not of work.

But, after all, dangers and difficulties are not to be either first or last considered. Before a Mission is planned, cautious, prayerful wisdom will forecast all that prudence would suggest to prevent mistake. And after a Mission has been determined on, and while it is being worked out, humble self-distrust will think of many things which betray the infirmity which attaches to the mind and hand of man.

But faith must not stop at dangers apprehended before, nor sigh over failure prophesied after, the Mission; but turning her large, loving eye towards Heaven, and looking up into the face of a loving Father in Christ Jesus—she will lay down all she has endeavoured to do in Christ's name, and say that it is God's work. When precious human souls are at stake, it is better even to be rash than heedless; when the power of the name and blood and grace of the Lord Jesus is considered, it is better to have gushing confidence than freezing caution; and looking to the faithful promises and the abounding grace of the all quickening, all comforting, all guiding Spirit, it is a real wisdom which can say, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?"

RITUALISM; THE EXTENT OF THE OUTBREAK AND THE NEED OF MORE EARNEST ACTION ON THE PART OF THE LAITY TO SUPPRESS IT.

BY JAMES BATEMAN, ESQ., M.A., F.R.S.,

Paper read at the Conference of the Church Association, held at
Victoria Rooms, Clifton, on the 25th and 26th October, 1876.

THE subject assigned to me is exceedingly wide. In order that it might be adequately presented to you within the compass of twenty minutes, it would be needful that—like the great Adversary himself, the author and abettor of Ritualism—I should place you on some commanding eminence and show you all the kingdoms of the earth in a moment of time. The plague has appeared in all the four quarters of the world—Europe, Asia, Africa and America. It has shown itself at the antipodes and in the islands of the Pacific Ocean. It has broken out in India, where two youthful prelates—the boy-bishops, as some irreverently style them—of Colombo and Bombay—the very incarnation of priestcraft and sacerdotalism, are undoing in an hour the labour of years, and seeking to convert the heathen with mitres and croziers, crosses and crucifixes, sisterhoods and brotherhoods, instead of by the plain preaching of the life giving Word. Then look at Africa, but we will take the great island of Madagascar on our way. Here we may reckon martyrs by hundreds and converts by thousands, chiefly gathered indeed by missionaries who were not members of the Church of England, but who were Christians for all that! Here also the red-tape of sacerdotalism has intruded itself and greatly hindered the work of evangelization, on the principles, I suppose, laid down by the Bishop of Colombo, that if 10,000 converts were made to-morrow by the Baptists or other irregulars, the circumstance would in the end be productive of more harm than good to the Church. Passing on to the mainland I feel almost tempted to despair of the Cape of Good Hope, when I see the strife that has been kindled by the episcopal champions of Rationalism and Ritualism.

Proceeding across the Atlantic we find many points attacked by the plague not only in Canada and the West Indies, but likewise in the United States, and I greatly fear lest the visit of the Bishops to our Pan-Anglican Synod may help to propagate the infection. In Europe the ground is mostly pre-occupied by the great struggle between German Protestantism and Ultramontane Popery, but even here wherever there are chaplains appointed by the Anglo-Continental Society or the S. P. G. 'tis much if there be

not an attempt to trick out some trumpery 'altar' and render English Churchmen ridiculous in the eyes of foreigners. And now we are in England once more, but it is not the England of forty years ago. *Hæu quantum mutatus ab illo!* The metamorphosis is wonderful! Mechanically and socially we may perhaps have changed for the better, but morally and ecclesiastically we have certainly changed for the worse. Just forty years ago as I was leaving Oxford, after taking my B.A. degree, I was told by a friend—who has since taken orders, and fallen into the snare of the day—that a school of Divines had arisen in the University which for learning would compare with the Fathers and for piety with the Christians of the Apostolic age. This was the first intimation I ever received of the Oxford movement of which, at its outset, such "very glorious things were spoken." But even then there were not a few who saw through the cheat and declared that the spirit by which it was animated was not a spirit of life or health, but a goblin from the abyss—Satan transformed into an angel of light. At first it was gentle in its movements and bland in its address, but as it gathered strength and confidence—like the lamb-like beast of the Apocalypse—it "spoke as a dragon" and sought to exercise all the powers of Priestcraft and Popery within the walls of our Protestant church. I need not tell *you* how the thing grew, until—as good Archbishop Sumner expresses it, its votaries "had gone on from one Romish practice and one Romish tenet to another until all that was distinctive of Protestant doctrine and Protestant worship had well nigh disappeared."

This was more than twenty-five years ago when Ritualism was yet in its teens. But what would his Grace have said had he lived to see these days! What would he have thought could he but have witnessed a service at All Saints', Margaret Street; or St. Alban's, Holborn; or even at All Saints', Clifton! Yet we are as far from the terminus as ever. Some ecclesiastical poltroons would fain persuade us that if the Ritualists were let alone and left in quiet possession of what they have got, they would ask for no more, and we should enter at once on an era of contentment and peace. Vain expectation! Such a notion ignores the solemn fact that the supreme arbitrament of peace or war rests with Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, and who will not give His glory to another. What, peace!—we may almost hear Him exclaim now as in the olden time—"What, peace, so long as the harlotries and sorceries of your mother Jezebel are so many! Peace! so long as there are thousands of the English clergy who daily in their Mass-houses crucify the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame!" There can be no *peace* until such abominations are done away, and as to *contentment*, the hope is equally baseless as I shall now proceed to show you from their chief organ, the *Church Quarterly Review*, which (in its number published a few days ago) is good enough to explain in an important article what are the changes and improvements required in our services and Prayer Book! Mark, *the Prayer Book!* Is it possible that the book to which they always referred as the gauge of their

loyalty to our Church—"neither less nor more," as they never wearied of telling us—is it possible that *that* book needs any change or is susceptible of any improvement? Well, listen. Here are a few of the changes and improvements which they intend to introduce—not with too much precipitation, indeed, but on "the principle of gradual restoration."

First of all we must have the apostolic and divine office of "Unction for the Sick."

Then we must have "The Sacrament Reserved." The xxxviiith Article indeed says "no," but the Ritualists say "yes."

We must also have, though not just yet, since there is still so much of the spirit of the Sadducee abroad, we must have "Intercessions for the Departed" introduced into our formularies.

And we must have lessons from "Maccabees" (thus raising the Apocrypha to the level of Scripture), and we must restore the Feast of the Holy Name. We must also find places in the calendar for the feasts of S. Basil, S. Polycarp, S. Anselm, S. Aidan, S. Columba, S. Leo (one of the Popes!) and a host of others. But why restrict the writings of these men—they were all canonized—to the learned? Why not, they say, read Thomas à Kempis as well as Ecclesiastes? for surely as much edification is to be found in the story of Polycarp's martyrdom as in the history of the wars of Amaziah and Josiah! This is a mere sample of what is to be done, but there is likewise much to be undone. For instance, we must get rid of what they call "the black rubric," at the end of the Communion office—very black indeed to them for it describes the act of which they are continually guilty, as "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians." After this, I need not waste your time in demonstrating the folly and futility of attempting to satisfy by any reasonable concession the Ritualistic appetite for Romish pottage. Depend upon it they will never cease from troubling us so long as any rag of Protestantism is left to flout their treachery. What then are we to do? The question is in a measure answered by the second portion of the heading of my paper, which calls upon the laity for increased exertion, which is tantamount to saying there is little use in making a similar call upon the clergy.

The simple fact is that the inferior clergy—among whom I include a vast number of meritorious incumbents and starving curates—could not put down this evil if they would, while the superior clergy—among whom I reckon a goodly number of Deans, Bishops and other dignitaries—would not put it down if they could. It therefore resolves itself into a layman's question. And we should remember that it was not among the laity but the clergy that the outbreak began. The laity, as a class, have escaped this ecclesiastical plague, and whenever they have had a chance have always testified their dread and detestation of it. And although they may have been unfairly cheated of the fruits of their victories, their opposition at the time was always successful. In the great surplice-wars of Exeter and Islington, the two ablest prelates on the bench, Philpotts and Blomfield, were obliged to cave in, and so likewise in a

vast number of other instances down to the passing of the Public Worship Act, which was carried as it were by acclamation, and came like a thunderbolt on the Ritualistic body. I may also gratefully allude to the almost uniform success which has accompanied our law proceedings, though here again the country is robbed of a great share of the benefit by the obstruction in certain quarters, and the procrastination in all. That the decisions, whenever we get them in the pending suits, will also be on our side, we cannot reasonably doubt; the only doubt is as to whether the Bishops will honestly set themselves to carry the same into effect, or whether they will persist in consecrating mass-houses, and in appointing Berdmore Comptons and Ben-Oliels as before. I fear they will, indeed some of them have said as much in their letters and pamphlets.

But if so—for we cannot be for ever prosecuting and doing the Bishop's proper work, and getting no thanks for it—we must have recourse to more heroic measures. We must invoke the genius of the constitution. We must appeal to the people, and demand of them a Protestant Parliament. The nation must take the matter up. This was what was done of old in days of glorious memory, and it will have, you may depend upon it, to be done again. And looking to this eventuality, it is a great encouragement to remember that, so strong was the Protestant instinct of the English people, that in the last election not a single constituency (outside Ireland of course) returned a Papist! And we have only to call upon electors to carry the principle a little further, and the Protestant edifice will be secured. Let us at the next general election determine that not one single Ritualist shall be returned to the Hall of St. Stephens, and the thing will be done. Such a resolution need not interfere with their political predilections. The members may be Whigs, or Tories, or Radicals—what you will—but let them first of all be Protestants. Such a parliament as would be thus assembled would soon set everything to rights. We should have no more appointments of boy-bishops by our Indian or Colonial secretaries, hindering the spread of the Gospel of Christ. Neither should we see our Bishops at home lending countenance and encouragement to clerical law-breakers. There would be no more episcopal benedictions of the corner-stones of Anglican Mass-houses, no more marching to music behind a banner of the Virgin, no more solemn installing of Denstone Provosts who have publicly declared their adhesion to the filthy Confessional. Something of this kind must inevitably be done if the Church or the country are to be saved from a fearful catastrophe; the sooner therefore we take the matter in hand and prepare for the next election the better. With this object in view we must organize, organize, organize, in every county and town and village, and till we find a better centre of action, I would suggest that the Church Association would answer our purpose exceedingly well

HOW BEST CAN THE ACTION OF BRANCH ASSOCIATIONS BE BROUGHT INTO CLOSER CONNECTION WITH THAT OF THE COUNCIL.

BY JAMES INSKIP, ESQ.

Paper read at the Conference of the Church Association, held at Victoria Rooms, Clifton, on the 25th and 26th October, 1876.

THE question assumes that the action of the Branch Associations may be brought into closer connection with that of the Council. And we may accept this position without reflecting upon the Branches or the Council or the officers of the Association. For, so long as we are in our present condition, the becoming attitude is that of pressing forward in all our undertakings, and especially in those which concern spiritual interests. We may, therefore, avoid any discussion of faults in one department or another, and dismiss abstract theories, while, acknowledging our shortcomings, we seek to encourage and strengthen each other with a view to future work. But this leaves us face to face with the practical difficulty suggested by the first word in our question, *How* can improvement be effected? It is manifest that the spirit in which we proceed is most important as the main-spring of all our machinery, and I, therefore, propose, in the first place, to mention two or three points which may be of value to us. You will understand that in doing this I speak to friends, and assume that we are united in the great principles of our faith. The first feature which I will notice is the danger lest our work should be regarded as occupying only a secondary position. In my judgment it is of equal importance with any other work in the Christian field, if, indeed, it have not stronger claims than any

other. This work touches the interests of every undertaking in which Churchmen, as such, can be engaged. Our friends may assert the superior claims of Home or Foreign Missions, the education of children, or the instruction of those of riper years; but these are means and agencies devised for conveying the blessings of the Gospel, while the Church Association has to do with the fountain (using the word in a secondary sense) from which all these agencies are supplied. If the Church of England is to be corrupt, what will be the value of her missions? If her clergy are to teach unscriptural doctrines, who can with confidence contribute money for sending them to foreign lands? In this matter we ought to be at least as wise as those who conduct earthly affairs. If persons charged with the duty of supplying water to a town should spend all their labour and money upon mechanical appliances, or improvements, while the fountain or source of their supply was becoming more and more impure, their efforts would be deemed valueless and foolish. The requirement would be that primary attention should be given to the quality and condition of the water before dealing with the quantity of the supply, or the mode of its communication. In like manner we may plant bishops in every quarter of the globe; we may prepare elaborate systems of Church government or order, but all will be worthless unless they are connected with a pure fountain, and employed to maintain and spread the knowledge of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ. I might enlarge upon this topic, but these observations are sufficient as a foundation for the appeal which I would earnestly make, that the work of preserving the purity of our national faith and teaching may be regarded and asserted as one of the most important in which we can engage. Again, our friends are sometimes disposed to accept Gamaliel's maxim, "If this thing be of man, it will come to nought," as if he had thereby expressed a Divine principle, whereas he, in fact, uttered only that which represents an imperfect idea of our responsibility and an entire ignorance of the manner in which evil is to be overcome. No doubt eventually everything of man alone will come to nought, but the question is whether we are to contend for the preservation of our nation and our country from the humiliation of being involved in such a result. For we must always remember that the final overthrow of evil cannot be carried out as an abstract principle, but

must include those who are unhappily led to thoroughly embrace the destructive element. Moreover, experience shows us that in our present state of existence unchallenged evil usually spreads, grows, developes, and intensifies, and does not of itself come to an end or cease to operate. Our Lord has warned us that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." History teaches that in many cases wonderful changes have been wrought and marvellous deliverances have been effected, but these have involved public commotion and disturbances as well as private and personal trial and suffering. This is an age of means and not of miracles, and if we wish to neutralize or eradicate that which is injurious, our duty is to adopt such an active course as may be commended to our judgment and conscience. And, finally, upon this point, if our friends think that the evil ought to be overcome, they can scarcely covet a position of inactivity and shrinking from the conflict, while they wish to share the victory. In dealing with the spirit which ought to animate our branches and our friends throughout the country, I will notice one more point; viz., that we should repose a generous confidence in our Association and the Council. There may be an occasional danger lest, with an anxiety to obtain our own ideal of perfect organization and infallible counsellors, we lose sight of the great truth that every good work in this world has been done, and must be done, by weak instruments, imperfect organizations, and frail men. The great object of the Association is to maintain the Protestant character of our Church and country. No other Society occupies the same ground, and if there be (I do not say there is) anything which may be regarded as indicative of weakness or defect, the right course for Protestants is to consider the object in view, the motives of its promoters, the work already done, and the blessings already received. With these in our memories and minds, we cannot be censorious or ready to stand aloof because we do not find an embodiment of our own views upon perhaps some minor matters. Let us not look for our own image and superscription, but rather for that of God, for the stamp of Divine approval. This generous support to which I allude is necessary for our friends in London, and good for us in the provinces. The former need our support as people who are bearing "the burden and heat of the day." They have been held up to

ridicule by some from whom we might expect better things. They have been described in opprobrious terms by foes, and sometimes coolly regarded by those who ought to be friends. It is due to such a body of men that we should yield them encouragement and support, not merely by routine or mechanical work, but with a generous spirit and a hearty sympathy which, borne with us individually into all departments of life, and the varied society in which we move, must exercise an influence and bear some fruit. And it will be good for ourselves that, if actuated by a right spirit and doing nothing for "strife or vainglory," we take part actively and avowedly in the existing struggle, and bear, if need be, the sneers and epithets which have been levelled at others. We need not be moved by such things, and many of us to-day can bear our testimony that we are not the worse for them.

You will forgive me for thus dwelling upon three points which have appeared to me of extreme importance as lying at the foundation of our action and connection with the Council; and I may sum up this part of my address by expressing the deep conviction that our present need is not so much new machinery as energized action and a hearty spirit. For this we must ever look primarily to Him who rules and directs the hearts of men; but, at the same time, we are bound to inquire whether we are seizing the opportunities presented to us, and cultivating in ourselves and encouraging in others such a spirit as is suited to the necessities of our day. I believe that our friends in London, from the Chairman and Council to all the officers of the Society, cordially accept the principles which I have ventured to advance, and have hitherto acted, and are still prepared to act, upon such convictions. Current events show that others take a different view. For instance, yesterday's local papers contained the report of a charge, or address, delivered by one for whom, on many personal as well as public grounds, we must entertain a real regard, and in that charge I find four adjectives applied to the controversy in which we are engaged. They are "miserable," "pitiful," "wearisome," and "unprofitable." If these adjectives had been applied to the causes of the controversy, they would have been apt words to describe Ritualistic innovations. We find many things

that are "miserable," more that are "wearisome," still more that are "pitiful," and most of all that are "unprofitable." The Right Rev. Prelate to whom I allude seems to think that there is a lull in the controversy. I should be glad to adopt the same conclusion if we could feel that the occasion for controversy had been reduced. But if there be a lull, I fear it must be attributed to want of zeal on the part of our friends, as it certainly is not due to any diminution of effort by our opponents. And it may be that the appearance of this room during the last two days, coupled with the fact that the English Church Union is at the same time holding meetings in this city, will be sufficient to show that the controversy is still unabated, and that although the first shout of advancing armies may be dying in the air, it is because the opposing forces are approaching one another and engaging in a closer combat which may precede the final struggle.

But I must hasten to add a few words upon practical matters. It is not easy to find room for them because, as I have already intimated, the growing experience of our excellent secretaries has from time to time suggested improvements and adaptations to keep pace with the times. I can only offer two or three suggestions. In the first place I would say to our friends in the country, whether in the largest or smallest places, "Do not be idle or silent." The subject must not be allowed to drop out of sight or fade out of memory. Even in small parishes and amongst isolated people good will be done by keeping up an interest in the question. But, someone says, divisions will ensue and unkind feelings may be excited. This may be true, but our Lord has said, "offences must needs come." You will not be the cause of the offence, and if the question is not now raised, a day will come when it must be raised in a more disastrous form. Another may say, My people know nothing about Ritualism, and I doubt the propriety of introducing the subject to their notice. The answer is obvious. They must and will know it. Ignorance and an unsuspecting mind are fertile soils in which superstition strikes its roots. And apart from this negative view, young men and young women come continually from quiet villages to supply the needs of our large towns and cities. They at

once encounter the evil, and it is not right to send them unarmed, unprepared, unwarned, into the battle-field, where they may fall ready victims to the foe. It is, on the other hand, an honourable distinction for the one man from this village, or the other from another spot, to take his place in an important town and to bear fruit of the seed sown and instruction given by the pastor of his youth. We may yet do more in our schools and with the working classes. In self-defence we must instruct the young, for our opponents lose no opportunity. I know a case in which a young man came from Gloucestershire to Bristol. The present Bishop of Ely was then the Vicar of a rural parish, and he gave a letter of introduction to the Vicar of All Saints', Clifton. We must not allow this to be done without an effort on our part in the contrary direction. There are friends in this room who may return to their own localities and at once collect some, if it only be a few persons, in whom, with God's blessing, an interest may be awakened. Give them something to do, and something to talk about, and great good may result for our Association in a quiet and unostentatious way. We know not, especially in these days, what will be the destiny of the young people passing under our hands. Of course the mode of action must differ with the varying circumstances of each locality. In some cases with the clergyman of a parish, in others without him, and in others even against him, those who take up the matter must adapt their form of proceeding to the necessities of the case. Only press the importance of the work, raise it from the level of petty squabbles, show that the people are invited to follow a "noble army of martyrs," and teach them with warm hearts to defend, support, and pray for the Church Association and its work. If efforts were made, many are the men who would go, at the sacrifice of time and ease, into various parts of the country for the purpose of interesting the people and illustrating by the black board of superstition the glorious light of the Gospel of Christ. For such proceedings the Council affords great facilities, information of all kinds is readily given, books are supplied, monthly publications are circulated, suggestions are invited, and if all these means and opportunities were fully utilized, they might be turned to a powerful purpose. And then from time to time you would hear the

hearty words of Mr. Concanon, the Organizing Secretary, and it may be that a Ryle, a Bardsley, or a Richardson would visit your neighbourhood and arouse attention by preaching or speaking in some central parish to which the inhabitants of other places could conveniently come. These suggestions are vague, but I cannot and would not give a stereotyped stiffness to our work. We need the freshness of individual action, so long as it tends in the right direction and converges upon the Council of our Association. The effect of all might be the eventual formation of a Committee for a group of parishes, a district, or even for a county, with union of branches as the circumstances may require. And when we have a Committee, whether in town or country, the Council thankfully receives suggestions, and actually invites quarter by quarter an expression of opinion upon many important questions. This means of communication may be largely utilized, and may keep up an interchange of thought through the body of Protestant Churchmen, and secure both united and hearty action.

Beyond this representatives may be appointed to take part in the proceedings of the Council. The chief difficulty about acting upon this power arises from the want of time and the expenditure of travelling expenses. These are, however, difficulties which may be overcome, if in no other way, at all events by choosing residents in or near London. Every county, nay, every town, has those in London who have gone from it with a knowledge of its people, its local circumstances, and its peculiar needs. Some of these might well be selected, as special representatives of the districts to which they belong, to attend the meetings of the Council in the interest of such districts. We must invade the enemy's country. Many parishes in which everything seems hopeless might be aroused if we had suitable means for bringing the subject before the people, and suggesting practical measures. This question must eventually be considered and settled. The English Church Union, with its kindred orders, guilds, and leagues, has a terrible network throughout the country. We must band ourselves to meet them. It may be that from many parishes infested by Ritualism we might draw forth some of the most earnest supporters of the Association, as they know the

evil from which they have suffered. The English Church Union professes peace and love ; one of its preachers in a Bristol church yesterday declared that the Union exists not for controversy, and that it seeks to wield the sword of the Spirit. Unhesitatingly I describe these statements as incorrect. When such a Society speaks to us of peace, we may adopt the words of Jehu, and say, " What hast thou to do with peace, so long as thou art introducing the abominations and corruptions of Rome ?" But we must do more ; we must have a counter-organization to meet the invading forces inch by inch, and as yet I know not how we can do this so well as by drawing near to the Council of the Church Association in the spirit to which I have adverted.

REASONS FOR OPPOSING RITUALISM.

By THE REV. CANON RYLE, M.A.,

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,

Hon. Canon of Norwich, Vicar of Stradbroke, and Rural Dean.

SHOULD we oppose Ritualism or let it alone? Is it our duty to sit still and allow Ritualists to do what they please? Or is it our duty to resist the progress of Ritualism by every means in our power? These are questions which seem to puzzle many Churchmen in the present day. They are questions to which I propose to supply an answer.

I submit then to the consideration of my fellow Churchmen that the life of the Church of England, and nothing less, is at stake. We have no choice, if we wish to keep the Church alive, we must contend earnestly for the truth. If we draw back, and refuse strife and contention for Christ's truth, there will soon be nothing for us but submission and disgrace. Some men may cry, "Peace, peace: oh, sacrifice anything for peace!" but there can be no real peace while our Church tolerates and fosters Popery. Is ecclesiastical peace so sweet, that it is worth purchasing at the expense of truth? Is a quiet life so precious, that in order to secure it we will tolerate transubstantiation and auricular confession? God forbid that we should say so! What others think I know not. For my own part my mind is made up. I have come to one decided conclusion. I say, Give me a really Protestant and Evangelical Church of England, or no Church of England at all. When the Reformed Church of England renounces her Protestant principles, and goes back to Popery, her glory will have departed. She will be an offence to God, and not a resting-place for any true Christian.

The ignorance of many Churchmen about the true nature and mischievous tendency of Ritualism is very great indeed. It is an ignorance so deplorably deep that it is like a judicial blindness. Some think that the whole Ritualistic controversy is a mere difference of opinion about matters of taste,—about dresses, and ornaments, and gestures, and postures, and flowers, and banners,—in fact about things which are utter trifles. Others think that it is only a new form of the old dispute between High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, and that both parties are equally wrong and equally right, and all the same at the bottom. Others think that

zealous and earnest people cannot be wrong, whatever they teach or do: and that as Ritualists are zealous and earnest, they ought to be let alone. Many are utterly unable to see differences, like persons afflicted with colour-blindness, who cannot distinguish red from blue. They cannot understand why all clergymen are not to be regarded as equally good and equally right, whatever they may think or do. The whole result is that Ritualism goes on and prospers, whilst honest Churchmen who come forward to oppose it are denounced and disliked as agitators, firebrands, and "troublers of Israel."

Nothing, unhappily, is so hard as to persuade men to inquire, examine, think, or read about any religious subject. If Churchmen would only examine for themselves the subject of Ritualism, I cannot believe they would ever be so apathetic as many seem to be about it. They would soon find that full-blown Ritualism is nothing less than an organized attempt to unprotestantize the Church of England, and to re-introduce among us the corrupt doctrines of the Church of Rome. They would find that the evils against which the friends of the Church Association contend are not mere matters of taste, but deadly spiritual diseases, which would completely destroy the Church of England if once allowed to prevail. They would find that full-blown Ritualism is a deliberate effort to bring Popish principles and practices into our pale, and that what the friends of the Church Association are defending are the old doctrines, the old truths, and the old paths of our martyred Reformers. They would find, in short, that it is most unfair and unreasonable to call the Church Association a turbulent, mischievous, and persecuting Institution, and that for all it has done and is doing there is good cause.

In order to supply information, I think it may be useful to put down in order ten of the main points in Ritualism to which the attention of Churchmen ought to be specially directed. They are extracted from a very useful publication sent out by the Church Association, entitled, "Church Association Tract No. IV." I am far from saying that all Ritualists hold all the positions set forth in these points. Some hold some of them, and some hold others. No doubt there are degrees in departure from the faith, and there are Ritualists and Ritualists! All I mean to say is, that when I speak of Ritualism as a dangerous system which ought to be opposed, I mean a system in which the following views are more or less supported and maintained:—

1. Most Ritualists *pervert the Communion Table into an Altar, and the Lord's Supper into a Sacrifice, and encourage the idea of a real material presence of Christ's body and blood, under the forms of the consecrated bread and wine.* Our Church on the contrary never calls the Lord's Table an altar in any part of the Prayer-book,—declares that the sacrifice of the Mass is "a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit,"—that Transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a sacrament,—that the natural body and blood of Christ are in heaven and not here,—and that any adoration of the sacramental

bread and wine is "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians." (Art. xxviii., xxxi., Communion Service Rubric.)

2. Many Ritualists *encourage and enjoin habitual auricular confession to a priest, and seek to restore judicial absolution by a priest, and the Romish Sacrament of Penance.* Our Church says, "It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not the warrant of God's Word." (Second part of Homily on Repentance.)

3. Many Ritualists *deny the sole authority of God's written Word. They add to it the so-called voice of the Church, or Catholic antiquity, or primitive teaching, or the traditions of the dark ages.* Our Church declares that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation" (Art. vi.); and that "while each Church has the right and the power to decree ceremonies (Art. xx.), it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written;" and "whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." (Art. vi.)

4. Many Ritualists *revile Protestantism. They vilify the Reformation and scoff at the Reformers, such as Cranmer, Latimer, and Jewel.* Yet these are the very men to whom we owe our English Bible and Prayer-book, our Articles, our freedom from Popish tyranny and superstition, our Protestant liberties, and the existence of a pure and reformed branch of Christ's Church in the realm!

5. Many Ritualists *declare that the doctrine of Rome and England is the same, and pray for union with the corrupt Church of Rome.*

6. Some Ritualists *hold, with the Church of Rome, that there are seven sacraments.* Our Twenty-fifth Article declares that there are only two sacraments ordained of Christ in the Gospel,—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

7. Some Ritualists *pray for the souls of the dead, declare their belief in purgatory, give an extravagant honour to the Virgin Mary and the Saints, and invoke their intercession.* Our Church says of such prayers that they are "vain things fondly invented, grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." (Art. xxii.)

8. Some Ritualists *introduce the practice of incensing persons and things, substituting wafers for bread at the Communion Service, multiplying lights and candles round the Lord's Table as if it was an altar, and clothing ministers in sacerdotal vestments borrowed from the corrupt Church of Rome.*

9. Some Ritualists *propose to abandon, and labour for the abolition of, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.* Yet the declaration prefixed to those Articles declares that they "contain the true doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God's Word."

10. Some Ritualists *recommend the reservation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* Our Twenty-eighth Article says: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

Now I ask plain Churchmen to read these ten points carefully,

and consider them well. If they wish to see the points proved in detail by documentary evidence they have only got to buy the tract from which they are extracted, and they will find proofs in abundance. But if Churchmen can read these statements and yet say that Ritualism ought not to be opposed, and is not a direct return to Popery, I can only say that they are very unsatisfactory members of the Church of England!

For my own part I maintain that Ritualism ought to be steadily opposed for the following reasons:—

1. Because it has no real authority in God's Word, and is not to be found anywhere in the New Testament.
2. Because it dishonours the One Sacrifice and priestly office of Christ, obscures the faith of the Gospel, and practically puts human mediators between Christ and the soul.
3. Because it is not to be found by any plain man in the Church's Articles and Prayer-book, and in many points is flatly contrary to their express teaching.
4. Because it tends to bring the laity into subjection to the clergy, and especially to enslave the consciences of women.
5. Because it leads direct to that Popery which was cast out of the Church 300 years ago by our Protestant Reformers.

Reader, what is your duty about Ritualism? Consider what I say, and the Lord give you understanding.

Are you a *true Christian*? Then I call on you to oppose Ritualism in every lawful way, both in defence of Jesus Christ's honour, and from respect for God's Word.

Are you a *true Churchman*? Then I call on you to oppose Ritualism in every lawful way, as a pernicious modern innovation, contrary to the letter and spirit of Church formularies, and most injurious to the Church of England.

Are you a *true Englishman*? Then I call on you to oppose Ritualism in every lawful way, as helping to bring back that Popery which made England cringe to a foreign potentate,—kept back the Bible from our people,—deluged our land with monkery, superstition, ignorance and immorality—burned our Protestant Reformers—and ruined millions of souls.

Reader, think on these things and act. Do not be ashamed of supporting the Church Association. Oppose Ritualism in every lawful way! Think on these things and pray. Use that prayer which King Edward the Sixth prayed three hours before his death: "O my Lord God, defend this realm from papistry, and maintain Thy true religion!"

No. LVI.]

WHAT DO WE OWE
TO
THE REFORMATION?

BY

THE REV. J. C. RYLE, M.A.,

CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,

Hon. Canon of Norwich, Vicar of Stradbroke, and Rural Dean.

WHAT DO WE OWE TO THE REFORMATION?

OUR lot is cast in days when it is the fashion to despise everything that is old. There is a morbid readiness to throw aside all things which bear about them the least mark of antiquity, and to treat them with as little respect as last year's almanacs or worn-out clothes. The only exceptions I can think of are old lace, old coins, old pictures, and old wine! But, as a general rule, old opinions and old institutions are too often condemned as useless lumber, and shovelled out of the way, simply because they are old.

Now I am not one of those who object to all changes and reforms of old things. Nothing of the kind. I heartily thank God for most of the changes of the last half century, whether political, or social, or scientific, or educational. I should not be an honest man if I did not declare my conviction that on the whole they are great improvements. But there is one subject about which I cannot take up new views, and that subject is the English Reformation. I cannot agree with those who now tell us that the Reformation was a blunder—that the Reformers are overpraised—that Protestantism has done this country no good—and that it would matter little if England placed her neck once more under the foot of the Pope of Rome. Against these new-fangled opinions I enter my solemn protest. I want no departure from the old Protestant paths which were cast up by Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, three hundred years ago. In short, about the value of the English Reformation I want no new views. I unhesitatingly maintain that “the old are better.”

The subject of this paper may seem a very simple one. But I fear there is a strange amount of ignorance about it, and a widely-spread disposition to undervalue the Protestant Reformation. Time has a wonderful power of dimming men's eyes, and deadening their recollection of benefits, and making them thankless and ungrateful. Three busy centuries have slipped away since England broke with Rome, and a generation has arisen which, like Israel under the Judges, knows little of the days of the Protestant Exodus, and of the struggles in the wilderness. Partly too, from a cowardly dislike to religious controversy, partly from a secret desire to appear liberal and condemn nobody's opinions, the Reformation period of English history is sadly slurred over both in Universities and Public Schools. It seems an inconvenient subject, and men give it the cold shoulder. Be the cause what it may, the Reformation period is too often shunted on a siding, and has not that prominent place in the education of young England which such a character-forming period most richly deserves. The whole result is that few people seem to understand either the evils from which the Reformation delivered us, or the blessings which the Reformation brought in. In short, many now-a-days regard the subject of Popery as a “bore.” They blindly persuade themselves that there is no mighty difference between Protestants and Papists at bottom. They say in their hearts, “A

plague on both your houses! it is six of one and half a dozen of another." To remove some of this ignorance, and let in a little light, is the simple aim of my paper. I want to make some of my countrymen understand that **WE OWE AN ENORMOUS DEBT TO THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.**

Let me clear the way by saying that I do not pretend to endorse the character of all the agents by whom the English Reformation was carried out, or to approve of everything which they did. I do not for a moment maintain that Henry VIII. was a godly man. No! Too often he was a brutal tyrant—I do not say that the statesmen who surrounded him were faultless characters. Far from it. Too many of them made a market of the Reformation, and enriched their families by plundering abbey lands—I do not ask you to believe that Cranmer, and other Reformers, either in the days of Henry the Eighth, or Edward the Sixth, or Elizabeth, were angels, and made no mistakes. I frankly admit that they did some things which they ought not to have done, and left undone some things which they ought to have done. But you must remember that God does a great deal of good work with very imperfect tools, such as Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar, and Cyrus. All I do maintain is, that the whole result of the Protestant Reformation was an enormous gain to this country. And I confidently assert that England before the Reformation was as unlike England after the Reformation as black and white, darkness and light, night and day. Facts, stubborn facts, exist to prove the correctness of this assertion, and some of these facts I shall try to bring before you.

I. I begin by saying that the Reformation *delivered England from an immense quantity of evils.* In describing those evils, it is hard to know where to begin and where to leave off. Their number is legion. The utmost I can do is to give you a short summary of them, and to ask you to believe that the half is left untold.

(a) For one thing the Reformation delivered England from *gross religious ignorance* and a spiritual darkness that might be felt. No doubt there was a professing Church of Christ in the land when Henry VIII. ascended the throne, a Church abounding in wealth, and garrisoned by a whole army of Bishops, Abbots, Friars, Priests, Monks, and Nuns. But money and clergymen do not make a Church of Christ any more than "men with muskets" make up an army. For any useful and soul-saving purposes the English Church was practically dead, and if St. Paul had come out of his grave and visited it, I doubt if he would have called it a Church at all. The plain truth is, that it was a Church without a Bible; and such a Church is as useless as a light-house without a light,—a candlestick without a candle—or a steam-engine without a fire. Except a few scattered copies of Wycliffe's translation of the Vulgate, there were no English Bibles in the land, and the natural consequence was that priests and people knew scarcely anything about God's truth and the way to be saved.

As to the *clergy*, as a general rule, their religion was the merest form, and scarcely deserved to be called Christianity at all. Most of them were pitiful turncoats without a conscience, and were ready

to change sides in religion at word of command. In fact they did so no less than four times;—once under Henry VIII., once under Edward VI., once under Bloody Mary, and once more under Elizabeth.

The immense majority of the clergy did little more than say masses and offer up pretended sacrifices—repeat Latin prayers, and chant Latin hymns which of course the people could not understand,—hear confessions, grant absolutions, give extreme unction, and take money to get dead people out of purgatory. Preaching was utterly at a discount. As Bishop Latimer truly remarked, “When the devil gets influence in a Church, up go candles and down goes preaching.” Quarterly sermons were indeed prescribed to the clergy, but not insisted on. Latimer says that while mass was never to be left unsaid for a single Sunday, sermons might be omitted for twenty Sundays in succession, and nobody was blamed. After all, when sermons were preached they were utterly unprofitable; and latterly, to preach much was to incur the suspicion of being a heretic.

To cap all, the return that Bishop Hooper got from the rich diocese of Gloucester, no barbarous and uncivilized corner of England, when he was first appointed Bishop in 1551, will give you a pretty clear idea of the ignorance of pre-Reformation times. He found that out of 311 clergy of his diocese, 168 were unable to repeat the Ten Commandments; 31 of the 168 could not say in what part of the Scripture they were to be found; 40 could not tell where the Lord’s Prayer was written; and 31 of the 40 did not know who was the author of the Lord’s Prayer!

As to the *laity* it is not too much to say that the bulk of them, except in the hour of trial, sickness, and death, had no religion at all. Even at such seasons as those there was no one to tell them of the love of God, the mediation of Christ, the glad tidings of free salvation, the precious blood of atonement, and justification by faith. They could only send for the priest, who knew nothing himself and could tell nothing to others; and then at last they received absolution and extreme unction, and took a leap in the dark. “The blind led the blind and both fell into the ditch.”

To sum up all in a few words, the religion of our English forefathers before the Reformation was a religion without knowledge, without faith, and without lively hope,—a religion without justification, regeneration, and sanctification,—a religion without any clear views of Christ or the Holy Ghost. Except in rare instances, it was little better than an organized system of Mary-worship, saint-worship, image-worship, relic-worship, pilgrimages, almsgivings, formalism, ceremonialism, processions, prostrations, bowings, crossings, fastings, confessions, penances, absolutions, masses, and blind obedience to the priests. It was a huge higgledy-piggledy of ignorance and idolatry, and serving an unknown God by deputy. The only practical result was that the priests took the people’s money, and undertook to secure their salvation, and the people flattered themselves that the more they gave to the priests the more sure they were to go to heaven. As to the grand cardinal question, “What must I do to be saved?” probably not one Englishman in fifty could

have given you half as good an answer as any ordinary Sunday school child would give in our own day. Such was the IGNORANCE which was scattered to the winds by the English Reformation. Mind you do not forget it.

(b) For another thing, the Reformation delivered England from the *most grovelling, childish, and superstitious practices* in religion. I allude especially to the worship of relics. Destitute of the slightest scriptural knowledge, our forefathers were taught by the priests to seek spiritual benefit from the so-called relics of dead saints, and to treat them with divine honour. The accounts which those trustworthy old historians Strype, and Fuller, and Burnet have handed down to us about these wretched relics up to the middle of Henry VIII's reign, are so extraordinary, that you ought to hear some of them.

At Reading Abbey in Berkshire, within a mile of the present station of the Great Western Railway, the following things among many others were exhibited by the monks on great occasions, and most religiously honoured by the people,—an angel with one wing,—the spear-head which pierced our Saviour's side,—two pieces of the Holy Cross,—St. James' hand,—St. Philip's stole,—a bone of Mary Magdalene, and a bone of Salome. (*Strype*, i. 390).

At Bury St. Edmund's, in Suffolk, the priests exhibited the coals that roasted St. Laurence, the parings of St. Edmund's toe-nails, Thomas à Becket's penknife and boots, and as many pieces of our Saviour's cross as would have made, if joined together, one large whole cross. They had also relics whose help was invoked at times when there was an excessive growth of weeds or an unusually heavy fall of rain!—*Burnet's Ref.* i. 486.

At Maiden Bradley Priory, in Somersetshire, the worshippers were privileged to see the Virgin Mary's smock, a piece of the stone upon which our Lord was born at Bethlehem, and a part of the bread used by Christ and the Apostles at the first Lord's Supper.—(*Strype*, i. 391.)

At Bruton Priory, in Somerset, was kept a girdle of the Virgin Mary made of red silk. This solemn relic was lent as a special favour to women in childbirth, to insure them a safe delivery. The like was done with a white girdle of Mary Magdalene, kept at Farley Abbey, in Wiltshire. In neither case, we may be sure, was the relic sent without a pecuniary consideration.—(*Strype*, i. 391.)

Even in the Midland Counties, I am sorry to say, superstition was just as bad as in the South of England. Strype records that at St. Mary's Nunnery, in Derby, the nuns had a piece of St. Thomas' shirt, and that it was worshipped by women expecting their confinement. At Dale Abbey, near Derby, they worshipped part of the girdle of the Virgin Mary, and some of her milk! At Repton Monastery the bell of St. Guthlac was held in special honour, and people put their heads under it to cure the headache. At Grace Dieu Nunnery in Leicestershire, they worshipped the girdle and part of the coat of St. Francis.—(*Strype*, i. 396.)

Records like these are so amazingly silly as well as painful, that

one hardly knows whether to laugh or to cry over them. But it is positively necessary to bring them forward, in order that men may know what was the religion of our forefathers in the days when Rome ruled the land before the Reformation. Wonderful as these things may seem, we must never forget that Englishmen at that time had no Bibles, and knew no better. A famishing man in sieges and blockades has been known to eat rats and mice and all manner of garbage, rather than die of hunger. A conscience-stricken soul, famishing for lack of God's Word, must not be judged too hardly, if it struggles to find comfort in the most debasing superstition. Only let us never forget that this was the SUPERSTITION which was shattered to pieces by the Reformation. Remember that. It was indeed a deliverance.

(c) For another thing, the Reformation delivered England from the *degrading tyranny and swindling impostures of the Romish priesthood*.

In the last days of the Pope's supremacy in this land the laity were thoroughly "sat upon" by the clergy, and could hardly call their souls their own. The power of the priests was practically despotic, and was used for every purpose except the advancement of true religion. Like the frogs in the plague of Egypt, they made their way everywhere, both in the palace and the cottage, met you at every turn of life, and had a finger in every transaction. They interfered by the confessional between husbands and wives,—between parents and children,—between masters and servants,—between landlords and tenants,—between subjects and sovereigns,—between souls and God. Obey them and you might do anything, and commit any sin. Resist them and you had no peace, and no safety either for property or life.

One great object which they steadily kept in view, was to enrich the Church and fill the pockets of their own order. To accomplish this end they employed many devices. Sometimes they persuaded tender-hearted affectionate persons to give money to get the souls of their relatives out of purgatory by procuring masses to be said for them. Sometimes they advised weak people to give huge sums to the shrine of some favourite saint, such as Thomas à Becket at Canterbury, in order to merit heaven by good works. Sometimes they induced dying sinners to give vast tracts of land to Abbeys and Monasteries, in order to atone for their bad lives. In one way or another they were continually drawing money out of the laity, and accumulating property in their own hands. "In fact," says Burnet, "if some laws had not restrained them, the greater part of all the estates in England had been given to religious houses."—(*Burnet's Reformation*, i. 378.)

The other object which they never forgot for a moment was to keep up their own power. For this purpose they claimed to hold the keys of heaven literally and really. To them confession must be made. Without their absolution and extreme unction no professing Christian could be saved. Without their masses no soul could be redeemed from purgatory. In short they were to all

intent and purposes the mediators between Christ and man. To please and honour them were the first of duties: to injure them was the greatest of sins. Fuller, the historian, tells us that in 1489 a certain Italian priest got an immense sum of money in England by obtaining power from the Pope "to absolve people from usury, theft, manslaughter, fornication, and all crime whatsoever except smiting the clergy and conspiring against the Pope." (*Fuller's Church Hist.*, i. 532, *Tegg's Edit.*)

As to the *gross and ridiculous impostures* which the priests practised on our ignorant forefathers before the Reformation, the catalogue would fill a volume. Of course I cannot do more than supply a few specimens.

At the Abbey of Hales, in Gloucestershire, a vial was shown by the priests on great occasions to those who offered alms, which was said to contain the blood of Christ. This notable vial was examined by the Royal Commissioners in Henry VIII.'s time, and was found to contain neither more nor less than the blood of a duck, which was renewed every week.

In the city of Worcester there was a huge image of the Virgin Mary, in one of the churches, which was held in special reverence. This also was examined by the same Royal Commissioners, in order to ascertain what it really was. But when it was stripped of certain veils which covered it, it turned out to be no image of the Virgin or of any woman at all, but the statue of some old Bishop.

At Bexley, in Kent, a great crucifix was exhibited, which received peculiar honour and large offerings, because of a continual miracle, which was said to attend its exhibition. When the worshippers before it offered copper coin, the face of the figure on the cross looked grave; when they offered silver it relaxed its severity; when they offered gold it openly smiled. In Henry VIII.'s time this famous crucifix also was examined, and wires were found within it, by which the attendant priests could move the face of the image, and make it assume any expression they pleased. (*Burnet's Ref.*, i. 486.)

He that desires to pursue this disgraceful subject any further will find it fully handled in Calvin's *Inventory of Relics* and Hobart Seymour's *Pilgrimage to Rome*. He will learn there that all over Europe things were shown as holy relics, so manifestly false and fictitious that the priests who showed them can only be regarded as cheats and rogues, who in this day would be sent to the treadmill or obliged to pick oakum. Wood of the true cross enough to load a ship, though we know one person alone could carry it,—thorns professing to be part of our Saviour's crown of thorns enough to make a large faggot,—at least fourteen nails said to have been used at the crucifixion, though we know four must have been sufficient,—four spear heads said to be points of the spear which pierced our Lord's side, though of course it had only one,—at least three seamless coats of Christ for which the soldiers cast lots, though there could only have been one,—all these are only select specimens of the profane and vile inventions with which Romish priests imposed on people before the Reformation. They must have known that they

were telling lies, and yet they persisted in telling them, and required the ignorant laity to believe them. Once more I remind you that for deliverance from this miserable system of **PRIESTLY TYRANNY AND PRIESTLY IMPOSITION** we are indebted to the Reformation.

(d) One more point remains to be mentioned. The Reformation delivered England from the worst plague that can afflict a nation, I mean the plague of *extreme unholiness and immorality among the clergy*.

The lives of the clergy, as a general rule, were simply scandalous, and the moral tone of the laity was naturally at the lowest ebb. Of course grapes will never grow on thorns, nor figs on thistles. To expect the huge roots of ignorance and superstition, which filled our land, to bear any but corrupt fruit, would be unreasonable and absurd. But a more thoroughly corrupt set than the English clergy were, in the palmy days of undisturbed Romanism, with a few brilliant exceptions, it would be impossible to imagine.

I might tell you of the habits of gluttony, drunkenness, and gambling, for which the parochial priesthood became unhappily notorious.

"Too often," says Professor Blunt, "they were persons taken from the lowest of the people, with all the gross habits of the class from which they sprang,—loiterers on the ale-house bench—dicers, scarce able to read by rote their paternoster, often unable to repeat the Ten Commandments,—mass-priests, who could just read their breviaries, and no more,—men often dubbed by the uncomplimentary names of Sir John Lack-Latin, Sir John Mumble-Matins, or Babbling and Blind Sir John. In fact, the carnal living, and general secularity of ministers of religion, were proverbial before the Reformation."—(*Professor Blunt's History of the Reformation*, p. 66.)

I might tell you of the shameless covetousness which marked the pre-Reformation priesthood. So long as a man gave liberal offerings at the shrine of such saints as Thomas à Becket, the clergy would absolve him of almost any sin. So long as a felon or malefactor paid the monks well, he might claim sanctuary within the precincts of religious houses, after any crime, and hardly any law could reach him. Yet all this time for Lollards and Wickliffites there was no mercy at all! The very carvings still extant in some old ecclesiastical buildings tell a story in stone and wood which speaks volumes to this day. Friars were often represented in these carvings as foxes preaching, with the neck of a stolen goose peeping out of the hood behind,—as wolves giving absolution, with a sheep muffled up in their cloaks,—as apes sitting by a sick man's bed, with a crucifix in one hand, and with the other in the sufferer's pocket. Things must indeed have been at a low ebb, when the faults of ordained ministers were so publicly held up to scorn!

But the blackest spot on the character of our pre-Reformation clergy in England is one of which it is painful to speak. I mean the impurity of their lives, and their horrible contempt of the Seventh Commandment. The results of auricular confession, carried on by men bound by their vow never to marry, were such that I

dare not enter into them. The consequences of shutting up herds of men and women, in the prime of life, in monasteries and nunneries, were such that I will not defile my paper by dwelling upon them. The details will be found in Strype, Burnet, and Fuller by those who care to look them up. Suffice it to say that the discoveries made by Henry VIII.'s Commissioners, of the goings on in many of the so-called religious houses, were such as it is impossible to describe. "It is a shame even to speak of them." Anything less "holy" than the practice of many of the "holy" men and women in these professedly "holy" retreats from sin and the world, the imagination cannot conceive. If ever there was a plausible theory weighed in the balance and found utterly wanting, it is the favourite theory that celibacy and monasticism promote holiness. Romantic young men and sentimental young ladies may mourn over the ruins of such abbeys as Battle, and Glastonbury, and Bolton, and Kirkstall, and Furness, and Croyland, and Bury, and Tintern. But I venture to conjecture that many of these houses are more useful now in their ruined condition than they ever were in their days of affluence and prosperity. I believe, in short, that monasteries and nunneries were frequently sinks of iniquity, and that too often monks and nuns were the scandal of Christianity.

I grant freely that all monasteries and nunneries were not equally bad. I admit that there were religious houses like Godstow Nunnery, near Oxford, which had a stainless reputation. But I fear that these were bright exceptions which only proved the truth of the rule. The preamble of the Act for Dissolution of Religious Houses, founded on the Report of Henry VIII.'s Commissioners, contains broad, general statements, which cannot be got over. It declares "that manifest sin, vicious, carnal, and abominable living is daily used and committed in abbeys, priories, and other religious houses of monks, canons, and nuns, and that albeit many continual visitations have been had, by the space of two hundred years or more, for an honest and charitable reformation of such unthrift, carnal, and abominable living, yet that nevertheless little or none amendment was hitherto had, but that their vicious living shamefully increased and augmented."—*Fuller*, ii., 208.

After all there is no surer receipt for promoting immorality than "fulness of bread and abundance of idleness." (*Ezek.* xvi. 49.) Take anywhere a number of men and women, of any nation, rank, or class—bind them by a vow of celibacy—shut them up in houses by themselves—give them plenty to eat and drink, and give them little or nothing to do—and above all give them no Bibles, no true religion, no preaching of the Gospel, no inspection, and no check from public opinion; and if the result of all this be not abundant breach of the Seventh Commandment, I can only say that I have read human nature in vain.

I make no apology for dwelling on these things. Painful and humbling as the picture is, it is one that in these times ought to be carefully looked at and not thrown aside. I do not want men to pass severe judgments on our poor ancestors, and say they were all

lost. We are not their Judge. To whom little light has been given of them little will be required. But I do want modern Churchmen to understand from what the Reformation delivered us. Before we make up our minds to give up Protestantism and receive back Monasticism and the "Catholic system," let us thoroughly understand what the state of England was when Popery had its own way unchecked and uncontrolled. My own belief is, that there never was a change so imperatively needed as the Reformation, and that no Englishmen ever did such good service to their country as the Reformers. In short, unless a man can disprove the plain historical facts recorded by Strype and Burnet, he must either admit that the times before the Reformation were bad times, or be content to be regarded as beside himself. To no class of men does England owe such a debt of gratitude as to her Protestant Reformers.

But what shall we say of the modern proposal to give up the principles of the Reformation and to return to the communion of the Church of Rome? What shall we say indeed! I say the man who makes such a proposal must have taken leave of his senses, or be utterly ignorant of the facts of history. Are we to return to a Church which boasts that she is infallible and never changes,—to a Church which has never repented of her pre-Reformation superstitions and abominations,—to a Church which has never confessed and abjured her countless corruptions? Are we really to go back to gross ignorance of religion—to childish superstition—to sacerdotal tyranny—to gross clerical immorality? Is this the Catholic land of promise? Shame on us, I say, if we entertain the idea for a moment. Let the Israelite return to Egypt, if he will. Let the prodigal go back to his husks among the swine. Let the dog return to his vomit. But let no Englishman with brains in his head ever listen to the idea of exchanging Protestantism for Popery, and returning to the bondage of the Church of Rome. No! indeed! we owe a mighty debt to the Reformation for having delivered us from an enormous mass of evil; and if some of my readers never realized the amount of that debt hitherto, I hope they will remember that it has been placed before them in this paper.

II. The second thing which I propose to do, is to show you very briefly the POSITIVE BLESSINGS which the English Reformation conferred upon this country. Hitherto we have only seen the immense evils from which it freed us. Let us now turn the tables and see the immense amount of good which it brought in. You have heard what it was that the Reformation destroyed and shattered to pieces. You shall now hear what it was that the Reformation built up in its place.

(a) First and foremost we owe to the Reformation an *English Bible, and liberty for every man, woman, and child in the land to read it*. With an English Bible came in the right and duty of private judgment, and the assertion of the great principle of our VIth Article, that "Holy Scripture contains all things needful to salvation," and is the only rule of faith and practice.

Of all the agencies which brought about the overthrow of Popery

in this country, the translation of the Bible was the earliest and the most powerful. It struck a blow at the root of the whole Romish system. Before a free Bible and fair play for all who used it, the Pope's champions could not long stand. The huge fabric of Popery cracked, shivered, and came to the ground like a pack of cards. With a Bible in every parish church in the land every thoughtful and intelligent Englishman soon saw that the religion of the priests had no warrant of Holy Scripture.

It is a striking and instructive fact that of all the agencies which combined to win the English Reformation, hardly any called forth such bitter opposition as the translation and circulation of the Scriptures. Even in 1519, long before Cranmer began his good work, Foxe records that six men and a woman were burned at Coventry for teaching their children the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. And the charge against the accused persons was, not the possession of a Bible, but of an English Bible, or "book of the new law in England." True to herself, the Church of Rome has always loved darkness and disliked the Scriptures.

Afterwards, when the Reformation fairly began, nothing seems to have alarmed and enraged the Romish priesthood so much as the spread of English Bibles. It was this which cost the martyred Reformer Tyndale his life. He was burned because he would translate and circulate the Scriptures. The relentless enmity with which he was persecuted and finally hunted to death by Sir Thomas More and others tells a tale which he who runs may read. The priests knew and felt that their game was up if the people once saw the inside of the Bible. You might as well have tried to stop the tide rising at Chepstow, or prevent Jupiter's satellites revolving round him, as to stop the progress of the Protestant cause when the laity once began to read the Scriptures. In vain Bishop Tunstall seized the book, and Bishop Bonner burned it at Paul's Cross. Its leading contents and principles ran through the land like fire, and from that period the Pope's cause in England was shaken to the centre. You that read the Bible daily and "delight in the law of the Lord," never forget that you owe that Bible to the Reformation.

(b) For another thing, we owe to the Reformation *an open road to the throne of grace and the great fountain of peace with God.*

That blessed road had been long blocked up and made impassable by heaps of rubbish of man's invention. Under pretence of mending and improving the road, the divines of Rome had spoiled it altogether. He who desired to obtain forgiveness had to seek it through a jungle of priests, saints, Mary-worship, masses, penances, confession, absolution, and the like, so that there might as well have been no throne of grace at all. The wells of water which were dug by the Apostles were stopped with earth by the Romish Philistines, and made practically useless.

This huge mass of rubbish was shovelled out of the way by the Reformers. The doctrine of our glorious XIth Article was every where preached, published, and proclaimed. People were taught that justification was by faith without the deeds of the law, and that

every heavy-laden sinner on earth had a right to go straight to the Lord Jesus Christ for remission of sins, without waiting for Pope or priest, confession or absolution, masses or extreme unction. From that time the backbone of English Popery was broken. You that are walking by faith, and enjoying peace with God by simple trust in the precious blood of Atonement, never forget any day that you owe this priceless privilege to the Reformation.

(c) For another thing, we owe to the Reformation *a true idea of Christian worship*.

In the days when Romanism ruled England undisturbed, the service of God's house must have been to most Englishmen a mysterious performance, which they left entirely in the hands of the priests. If they were present at any Church service, they could only be present as sleeping partners, or passive, ignorant spectators. It was a mere formal histrionic worship, to which the laity could only bring their bodies, but in which their minds, and reason, and spirit, and understanding, could take no part at all.

This solemn farce was completely stopped by our Reformers. They laid down the great principle of our XXIVth Article, that "it is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people." They introduced into every English parish the English Bible, an English Prayer-book, English preaching, simple, plain services, and a simple untheatrical administration of Christ's two sacraments. Of course they could not make the people Christians. But from the Isle of Wight to Berwick-on-Tweed, and from the Land's End to the North Foreland, a worship was set up in every parish church which the poorest labourer might understand. You that really enjoy the simple service of our Liturgy (and when heartily and devoutly performed there is nothing like it), do not forget every Sunday that for this also you are indebted to the Reformation.

(d) For another thing, we owe to the Reformation *a true notion of the office of a Christian minister*.

Before the eyes of Englishmen were opened by the Bible, it was a settled idea in all men's minds that the Christian ministry was a sacerdotal ministry, like that of the Jews, and that every clergyman was a sacrificing priest. The clergy were supposed to hold the keys of heaven, and to be practically mediators between God and man. The natural result was that they generally became spiritual tyrants, and were exalted to a position which was enough to turn the head of any mortal man. Placed far too high, the priests became lords and despots. Placed far too low, the laity became serfs and slaves.

The Reformers brought the office of the clergy down to its scriptural level. They stripped it entirely of any sacerdotal character. They cast out the words "sacrifice" and "altar" from the Prayer-book, and though they retained the word "priest," retained it only in the sense of "presbyter" or "elder." They taught the people everywhere that the clergy were not the lords of the Church, but, like Paul and Timothy, its servants (Phil. i. 1), ambassadors, mes-

sengers, witnesses, evangelists, teachers, and ministers of the word and sacraments. Above all, they declared, as the ordination service of our Church shows, that the chief business of a Christian minister is "to preach the word, to be diligent in prayer and reading the Scriptures, and to lay aside the study of the world and the flesh." And as to any power of the keys, and binding and loosing, they taught, as Jewell's *Apologety* distinctly informs us, that it was to be exercised by preaching the Gospel to the penitent and setting before him an open door, and by warning open sinners that continuing in sin they would find heaven's gates shut against them. You that know the value of a true Christian minister, and the immense superiority of the pulpit to the confessional, never forget that for clear light on this point you are indebted to the Reformation.

(e) Finally, we owe to the Reformation a *right standard of Christian holiness*.

Before the days of Henry VIII. it was held by all as an axiom admitting of no denial, that a monastic life and vows of celibacy were the only ways to attain eminent sanctity and escape sin. Myriads of men and women were continually becoming monks and nuns, under the vain idea of becoming religious by cutting themselves off from their place in society and leaving the world. What an utter delusion the idea was you have already heard. In practice the theory completely failed and broke down.

The Reformers cut up by the roots this most fallacious idea, by dissolving religious houses and dispersing their inhabitants. The thing was done roughly, no doubt, and the property of many of the abbeys and monasteries was disgracefully misapplied. But the measure was a wise one, and like a severe surgical operation, it saved health at the cost of temporary suffering. The great scriptural principle was established that true religion is to be seen not in retiring into holes and corners, and fleeing from difficulties, but in doing our duty in every position to which God calls us, and manfully facing our foes. It is not by running away from the devil, and giving up the management of the world to him, but by manfully resisting the devil and overcoming him that true holiness is to be exhibited. The Reformers ordered the Ten Commandments to be set up in every parish church and taught to every child, and the duty toward God and our neighbour to be set forth in the old Catechism. They refused to give the slightest encouragement to the plausible notion of becoming saints by shirking the duties of our station. It is not too much to say that in process of time this new principle had an elevating and purifying effect on the whole tone of English morals. If England, with all her many faults, has a higher standard of daily life than most countries, let us never forget that we owe it to the Reformation.

Such is a brief and condensed account of the positive blessings which the Reformation has conferred upon England. I have purposely done little more than name them, because they are not bygone things like Popish superstitions, but living privileges with which we are all familiar. We bask in the full sunshine of them. They are

a part of the air we breathe. They are a rich inheritance which every resident in England unconsciously, I fear, in many cases, enjoys at this day. Our very familiarity with them is a danger. We have not the smallest idea of the religious blessings we enjoy compared to our ancestors four hundred years ago. We have neither an adequate conception of the evils from which the Reformation freed us, nor of the enormous good which it brought in. But this I am bold to assert:—whatever England is among the nations of the earth as a Christian country,—whatever political liberty we have,—whatever light and freedom in religion,—whatever purity and happiness there is in our homes,—whatever protection and care for the poor,—we owe it to the Protestant Reformation. The man that does not see all this is, in my humble judgment, a very blind and a very ungrateful man.

I admit freely that we have nothing to boast of. Our open Bibles and our preached Gospel, our civil and religious liberties, our abundant means of grace, all these things are sadly neglected and misused. Our misuse of privileges cries against us to heaven. But after all we are in a far better state than we were four hundred years ago. There are facts which speak louder than words, and facts which the admirers of the old Catholic system, as it is called, can never get over.

The Reformation found Englishmen steeped in ignorance, and left them in possession of knowledge,—found them without Bibles, and left them with a Bible in every parish,—found them in darkness and left them in comparative light,—found them priest-ridden, and left them enjoying the liberty which Christ bestows,—found them strangers to the blood of atonement, to faith, and grace, and holiness, and left them with the key to those things in their hands,—found them blind, and left them seeing,—found them slaves, and left them free.

For ever let us thank God for the Reformation! It lighted a candle which ought never to be extinguished or allowed to grow dim. And for ever let us remember that the Reformation was won for us by the blood of the martyrs quite as much as by their preaching and praying, and writing and legislation. It was forged in the fires of Oxford and Smithfield. It cost the lives of one Archbishop, four Bishops, and 280 other men and women, who died rather than give place to Popery. Shall we in this nineteenth century talk lightly of the great work which they did? Shall we hold cheaply the privileges which they won? Shall we entertain for a moment the idea of forsaking Reformation principles and going back to Rome? Once more I say, God forbid! The man who counsels such base apostasy and suicidal folly must be judicially blind, and is a most unworthy member of the Church of England. The iron collar has been broken; let us not put it on again. The prison has been thrown open; let us not resume the yoke and return to our chains.

III. The last thing which I propose to do, is to point out *the danger in which the cause of the Reformation is placed at this day by*

that mischievous Romanizing movement within the Church of England, which, rightly or wrongly, is called Ritualism.

Now a question arises at the very outset of this part of my subject which demands consideration. Is the movement called Ritualism a movement towards Rome or not? Do the Ritualists really wish to suppress Protestantism, and re-introduce Popery? Hundreds of well-meaning and simple-minded Churchmen reply, No! They would have us believe that Ritualists are only aiming at a more ornate ceremonial than other Churchmen, and that they are not Romanizers at all. It is only, they say, a question of more or less flowers, more or less ornament, and more or less æstheticism and high art. It is not a question of Popery at all. With these amiable apologists I have no sympathy. I believe they are utterly and entirely mistaken. The question is one on which I feel no manner of doubt. That Ritualism is a Romeward movement, and a departure from the Reformation, and that it leads to Popery, is as clear to my mind as the sun at noon-day. The proofs, in my humble judgment, are clear, full, and unanswerable.

(a) It is proved by the writings of all the leading Ritualists of the day. Let any honest and impartial Churchman study such papers as the *Church Times*, read some of the *Catechisms* and *Manuals of Devotion*, published by Ritualistic clergymen, peruse the debates of proceedings of such bodies as the English Church Union, and tell us plainly the impresssion these writings have on his mind. I defy him to avoid the conclusion that Ritualism is the highway to Rome.

(b) It is proved by the repeated secession of Ritualists from the Church of England to the Church of Rome. Why have such men as Manning, and Newman, and Oakley, and Dodsworth, and Faber, and the two Wilberforces, gone over to the Pope's camp? Simply because they found the principles of their school could land them in no other logical conclusion. But their migration was one more proof that Ritualism is the highway to Rome.

(c) It is proved by the repeated reference to the subject which Bishops have made in their charges for the last thirty years. Mild, and gentle, and conciliatory to an extreme, as these documents have too often been, it is impossible not to see that most of our Prelates detect a Romeward tendency in Ritualism. Their cautions to Ritualists, you will notice, are almost always in one direction. "Take care, my dear children," they seem to say, "that you do not go too far in a Romish direction. You are excellent, learned, charming, delightful, earnest, useful fellows; but don't go too near the edge. Your danger is, tumbling over into the arms of Rome."

(d) It is proved by the rejoicings of the Roman Catholics themselves over the whole Ritualistic movement, and the disgust with which it is regarded by Scotch Presbyterians, real old-fashioned Nonconformists, and most English Methodists. Both the joy of the one party and the disgust of the other arise from the same cause. Both see clearly that Ritualism damages Protestantism, and helps the Pope. Lookers-on are good judges of the game.

(e) It is proved, above all, by the unvarying character of all the

ceremonial novelties which Ritualists have thrust into our Church worship during the last twenty-five years. They have all been in one direction, whether of dress, or gesture, or posture, or action, or anything else. They have all been as un-Protestant as possible. They have all been borrowed or imitated from Popery. They have all exhibited one common bias, and animus,—an anxious desire to get as far as possible from the ways of the Reformers, and to get as near as possible, whether legally or illegally, to the ways of Rome. They have all shown one common systematic determination to un-Protestantize, as far as possible, the simple worship of the poor old Church of England, and to assimilate it, as far as possible, to the gaudy, theatrical, and sensuous worship of Popery. A short catalogue of specimens will show you what I mean.

The Reformers found the sacrifice of the mass in our Church. They cast it out as a “blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit,” and called the Lord’s Supper a sacrament. The Ritualists have re-introduced the word “sacrifice,” and glory in calling the Lord’s Supper “a mass!”

The Reformers found altars in all our churches. They ordered them to be taken down, cast the word “altar” entirely out of our Prayer-book, and spoke only of the Lord’s table and the Lord’s board. The Ritualists delight in calling the Lord’s table “the altar,” and setting up Popish altars in all their churches!

The Reformers found our clergy sacrificing priests, and made them prayer-reading, preaching ministers,—ministers of God’s Word and Sacraments. The Ritualists glory in calling every clergyman a sacrificing priest!

The Reformers found in our Church the doctrine of a real corporal presence of Christ in the Lord’s Supper under the forms of bread and wine, and laid down their lives to oppose it. They would not even allow the expression, “real presence,” a place in our Prayer-book. The Ritualists have re-introduced the doctrine, and adore the consecrated elements as if Christ’s natural body and blood were in them.

The Reformers found in all our churches images, rood screens, crucifixes, and holy places, and indignantly cast them out or prohibited them. The Ritualists are incessantly trying to bring them back.

The Reformers found our worship stuffed with processions, incense burning, flag carrying, candles, gestures, postures, flowers, and gaudy sacrificial garments, and ordered them all to be put away. The Ritualists are always labouring to re-introduce them.

The Reformers found prayers to the dead saints a regular part of English worship, and cast them out. They declared the invocation of saints, in our XXIInd Article, to be “a fond thing vainly invented, grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” The Ritualists now advocate praying to the saints.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the House of Lords, on 20th April, 1874, gave documentary proof that such prayers as these are

recommended by Ritualists, "I beg the Blessed Mary, our Virgin, Blessed Michael the Archangel, Blessed John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and all the Saints, to pray to the Lord our God for me."

The Reformers declared that the Sovereign had supreme authority and chief power in this realm in all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil. The Ritualists maintain that the Church is above the State. The decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts are treated by them with undisguised contempt. They forget that the attempt to make Convocation independent of Parliament in 1640 was one of the very things which cost Archbishop Laud his head, and brought on the wars of the Commonwealth.

Last, and worst of all, the Ritualists are reviving the detestable practice of Auricular Confession. This is the practice which is distinctly denounced by the Reformers in the Homily of Repentance and in Jewell's *Apology*. This is the practice which has been tried in days gone by, and has led to such abominable immorality, that even a Pope of Rome issued a Bull against things connected with it and arising out of it in Spain. This miserable, detestable practice the Ritualists have galvanized into fresh existence, and are trying everywhere to reintroduce. Of all the mischievous Popish revivals for which they are responsible in this day this is the worst. I do not admire all the sayings and doings of the late Bishop Wilberforce. But I cannot forget that one of his last public addresses contained the following wise sentence, "the system of Confession is one of the worst developments of Popery."

Can any one in his senses doubt what all this means? Straws show which way the wind blows. Ceremonial trifles show the current of religious feeling. He that looks at the catalogue of facts which I have just brought forward, and then tells us that there is no tendency in Ritualism towards Rome, is past all argument, and must be let alone. There are none so blind as those who will not see. "We are bound," said Dr. Johnson, "to find arguments for men, but we are not bound to find them brains." Why, even Dean Burgon, the Dean of Chichester, an unmistakeable High Churchman, has published a sermon on the subject, called "Romanizing in the Church of England." It is a sermon which deserves attentive reading, because of its plain outburst of indignation against Ritualism. It exposes in scathing language the Mary-worship and the unscriptural teaching about Confession and Holy Communion which disgrace the Ritualist body. It contains among scores of true and good things this notable sentence, "The only logical result of such principles and practices within the Church of England will be to betray many unstable souls into the hands of the Church of Rome." Surely in the face of such a witness as this it is absurd to tell us that Ritualism has no tendency to Popery, and is not the highway to Rome!

But after all, is Ritualism doing any harm to the Church of England? With all its faults and defects, does not the movement do more good than evil? Is it not better to "believe all things, and

hope all things," and to leave Ritualism alone? Is it not unkind and naughty to interfere with such earnest, devoted men? These are questions which many in their simplicity are continually asking, and they are questions which demand a plain answer.

Some tell us that Ritualism has revived the Church, rallied the laity, infused a new spirit into the Establishment, lengthened her cords, and strengthened her stakes. Some tell us that the existence of a Ritualistic party in our Church is an excellent and healthy symptom, that parties keep each other in check, and act as counter-irritants in the constitution, and that except Ritualism abides in the Church we shall not be saved. My own opinion is diametrically the reverse. I believe that Ritualism has done, and is doing, enormous damage to the Church of England, and that unless checked or removed, it will prove the destruction of the Establishment.

Ritualism is dividing the clergy into two distinct parties, and hastening on an internecine conflict. So long as the difference was only between High Church and Low Church, little harm was done. But when the struggle is between Popery and Protestantism, union is impossible. Both parties cannot possibly co-operate with any advantage in the same ecclesiastical pale, and it is preposterous to suppose they can. One or the other is in the wrong place. What saith the Scripture? The Master Himself has declared "If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand." (Mark iii. 25.)

Ritualism is gradually robbing our Church of some of its best members among the laity. Not a few bankers, lawyers, doctors, and merchants are dropping off and leaving the ship. Their confidence is thoroughly shaken. They cannot understand an Established Church in which the service is Popish in one parish and Protestant in another. They are becoming disgusted with the continued toleration of Popish novelties, which their own common sense tells them are as thoroughly unchurchmanlike as they are unscriptural. Some of them go off to the Plymouth Brethren, some join the Dissenters, and some stand aloof altogether, and refuse to take any part in the Church's affairs. This state of things is most mischievous. The life blood of the Church is being drained away.

Ritualism is alienating the middle classes and lower orders from the Church of England. Thousands of tradesmen, and farmers, and artisans have an instinctive horror of Popery. They may not be very intelligent or deeply read in theological matters, but they are determined not to put up with Popery. They cannot draw nice distinctions: they are apt to call a spade a spade, and to give things their right names. And if they see the slightest attempt to re-introduce Popish ceremonies into their parish churches their suspicions are aroused, and they walk off to chapel. The Churchman who allows these suspicions to be roused, be he Bishop or Presbyter, may be earnest, well meaning, and zealous, but he is no true friend to the Church of England.

Once for all I must honestly avow that my chief fears of Ritualism arise from the effect which it has on the minds of the lower and

middle classes. They do not like it. They will not have it. They call it **POPERY**.

Shallow-minded members of the aristocracy—ill-taught ascetics—self-willed and half-instructed members of Evangelical families who want to mix ball-going and worldliness with religious formalism, and to compound for the one by supporting the other—idle young ladies and thoughtless young men, who love anything gandy, showy, sensational, and theatrical in worship, or like to show their independence by disagreeing with their parents—all these may stick to Ritualism and stoutly support it. They are like children who admire poppies more than corn, and like babies who care for toys more than food. But Ritualism does not meet the wants of the hard-working, the hard-headed, the hard-handed masses of the middle classes and intelligent artisans, the brain and muscle of England. These men want food for their souls and rest for their consciences. They find life too hard and heart-wearing to be content with trifles and toys in worship. If the Church can only offer them Ritualism they will turn away from her in disgust. If she will faithfully give them the pure Gospel, they will never leave her, and never forsake her.

Only let Ritualism grow and spread for a few more years and the end will come. The Church will perish for want of Churchmen. Generals and colonels and bands of music do not make up an army, and Bishops and choristers and clergy alone do not make up a Church. The Church of England will never stand if it disgusts and drives away its congregations. Disestablishment will come as a matter of course. The Church of a minority will not be spared in England any more than in Ireland. Statesmen and mob-orators alike will declare that the English Establishment is “a huge anomaly,” and must be got rid of. The voice of the people will demand our destruction; and on modern principles it will be obeyed. The Church of England once disestablished, will split into pieces, or become a mere sect, like the Scotch Episcopal Church; and the pages of history will then record that she made shipwreck of all her greatness by the suicidal attempt to recede from the principles of the Reformation and re-introduce Popery.

Whether my fears are well founded time alone will show. But I should not be doing my duty as an honest man if I did not state most distinctly my impression that we are in a most critical position, and that the future must be regarded with deep anxiety. In short, I have a firm belief,—a belief shared in by not one or two only of our Bishops—that unless Ritualism dries up or is checked, the Established Church of this country in a very few years will be broken to pieces. Some of the leaders of the Ritualists, I willingly allow, are zealous, earnest, devoted, able, well-meaning men. They may conscientiously believe, like many of Laud’s school, that they are helping the Church of England and “doing God’s service.” But it is my firm belief that, like Laud’s school, they are ruining the Church instead of helping it, and are likely to bring the whole house to the ground.

Let me now conclude all I have said with a few pieces of plain practical advice.

(1.) For one thing, I advise you to resist manfully the efforts now being made to unprotestantize England, and to bring her once more into subjection to Popery. Let us not go back to ignorance, superstition, priestcraft, and immorality. Our forefathers tried Popery long ago, and threw it off with disgust and indignation. Let us not put the clock back and return to Egypt. Let us have no peace with Rome, till Rome abjures her errors and is at peace with Christ. When Rome does that, and not till then, it will be time to talk of reunion with her. But till then the vaunted movement for a "Reunion of Western Churches" is an insult to Christianity.

Read your Bibles and be armed with scriptural arguments. A Bible-reading laity is a nation's surest defence against error. I have no fear for English Protestantism if the laity will only do their duty.

Read history, and see what Rome did in days gone by. Read how she trampled on your country's liberties, plundered your forefather's pockets, and kept the whole nation ignorant and immoral. Read Foxe, and Strype, and Fuller, and Burnet, and Soames, and Professor J. J. Blunt and Froude's Life of Queen Mary. And do not forget that Rome never changes. It is her boast and glory that she is infallible and always the same. Only give her power in England, and she will soon play the old game; first soothe us to sleep, and then put out the eyes of our country, and make her like Samson, a degraded slave.

Read facts standing out on the face of the globe. What has made Italy what she was till very lately? *Popery*.—What has made Mexico and the South American States what they are? *Popery*.—What has made Spain and Portugal what they are? *Popery*.—What has made Ireland what she is? *Popery*.—What makes Scotland, the United States, and our own beloved England, the powerful, prosperous countries that they are at present, and I pray God they may long continue? I answer in one word, PROTESTANTISM,—a free Bible and a Protestant ministry, and the principles of the Reformation. Think twice before you give ear to the specious arguments of liberalism, falsely so called. Think twice before you help to bring back the reign of Popery.

(2.) For another thing, I charge you to beware of Ritualism, and to do all you can to resist it. Ritualism is the high road to Rome, and the triumph of Ritualism will be the restoration of Popery.

Resist it in *little things*. Resist strange dresses, sacrificial garments, the eastward position in consecrating the bread and wine, idolatrous reverence of the consecrated elements, processions, banners, incense, candles on the Communion-table, turning to the East, crosses at the East, and extravagant church decorations. Resist them manfully. They seem trifles, but they frequently lead to a great deal of mischief, and they often end in downright Popery.

Resist it in *great things*. Oppose with might and main the attempt to re-introduce the Popish Mass and Auricular Confession in our parishes. Send your boy to no school where auricular confession is ever tolerated. Allow no clergyman to draw your wife

and daughter to private confession. Oppose sternly but firmly the attempt to change the Lord's Supper at your parish churches into the Romish sacrifice of the mass. Draw back from the communion in such churches, and go elsewhere. The laity have a great deal of power in this matter, even without going to law. They can do a great deal if they will only attend all vestry meetings about Church matters and tell the clergy their minds. The clergy cannot do without the laity any more than officers in a regiment can do without privates. If the English laity all over England would rise in their might and say, "We will not have the mass and auricular confession," Ritualism would wither away in a very short time.

Resist it for Christ's sake. His priestly and mediatorial offices are injured and dishonoured by Ritualism. They are offices He has never deputed to any order of ordained men.

Resist it for the Church of England's sake. If Ritualism triumphs, the days of the Church are numbered. The laity will leave her, and she will die for want of Churchmen.

Resist it for the clergy's sake. The worst and cruellest thing that can be done to us, is to lift us out of our proper places, and make us lords over your consciences, and mediators between yourselves and God.

Resist it for the laity's sake. The most degrading position in which laymen can be put is that of being cringing slaves at the foot of a brother sinner.

Resist it, not least, for your children's sake. Do what in you lies to provide that, when you are dead and gone, they shall not be left to the tender mercies of Popery. As ever you would meet your boys and girls in heaven, take care that the Church of England in your day is maintained a Protestant Church, and preserves her Articles and the principles of the Reformation wholly uninjured and undefiled.

(3.) My third piece of advice is this. Do not be in a hurry to leave the Church of England, because many of her clergy are unfaithful. It is cheap and easy policy for Churchmen to shirk trouble and run away in the hour of conflict; but it is neither manly, nor Christian, nor kind. It is a short-cut road out of difficulties, to launch the long-boat when the good ship is in jeopardy, and to leave your comrades to sink. But it is not the line of action which becomes an Englishman. As Nelson said at Trafalgar, "England expects every man to do his duty," and so does the Church of England expect every Protestant Churchman to do his duty, and stick by the ship. Away with this talk about secession! Away with this flirting with Plymouth Brethrenism! Let us not play the enemy's game, by deserting the good old fortress, so long as the Articles are unchanged and the pulpit is unfettered. Let us not basely forsake our old mother in her day of trouble. Rather, like Venn, and Romaine, and Grimshaw, and Berridge, let us man the old walls, stand to our guns, nail our colours to the mast, and fight as long as we have a foot of ground to stand on. Sneaks and deserters who are always making strategical movements to the rear are the weakness

of an army. Rabbit-hearted Churchmen, who are always bolting into holes at the slightest shadow of collision, trouble, or danger, are the best allies of Ritualism.

(4.) My fourth and last piece of advice is this. Work every one, both publicly and privately, and work hard, for the defence of Christ's truth and the maintenance of Reformation principles in the Church of England. But work together in an organized and systematic way, or else you will do very little. "Men with muskets" do not make an army, as the French found to their cost in the late Franco-German war, and Evangelical Churchmen without organization will do but little in opposing Ritualism. Associate, unite, organize, work together, keep together, and much may be done. Work charitably and kindly, and make allowance for the utter ignorance in which many Ritualists live of the real nature of Evangelical principles. Many of them, alas, appear to know no more of the views of Evangelical Churchmen than an illiterate country labourer knows of the streets of London, or a native of Timbuctoo knows of ice-creams. They do not know what we hold. They talk and write as if they had never heard of any Theological School but their own! Remember this, and deal gently with them. But while you work charitably, loving, courteously, kindly, do not forget to work hard.

Work, not least, I ask you in union with the Church Association. That Society, I am aware, is very unpopular, and greatly disliked in many quarters. It certainly escapes the woe pronounced on those of whom all men speak well! It is too often regarded as a mischievous, intolerant, persecuting body. I hear such charges with perfect indifference. I remember that poachers do not like gamekeepers, and burglars do not like watchdogs, and thieves do not like police, and Ahab did not like Elijah, and I cannot expect Ritualists to like the Church Association. But when Bishops, a few years ago, would or could do nothing, when Popery was coming in on our Church like a flood, I challenge any man to tell me what better thing could have been done than to form the Church Association, for defence not for defiance, for conservation of the Church, not for persecution. As David said to Eliab, "Is there not a cause?" (1 Sam. xvii. 29.) As Jephthah said to Ephraim, "When I saw that ye delivered me not I put my life in my hands, and passed over against the children of Ammon." (Judges xii. 3.)

We who are members or friends of the Church Association lay no claim to perfection, and may have made many mistakes; but at any rate we have done what we could for the Church of England, and have not stood still, and let her be ruined without a struggle.

As for those respectable High Churchmen of the School of Andrews and Hooker, who tell us they dislike Ritualism and are afraid of it, but will not lift a finger to help the Church Association, I can only say I am sorry for them. I believe they are committing a great error. I believe the policy of inaction and sitting still and waiting for something to turn up, is mischievous in the extreme. The conspiracy grows while they sit by with folded arms, with a masterly inactivity, and bids fair to ruin the Church of England. What they expect

and what they propose to do I cannot understand. They profess to dislike our line of action but they do not show us a more excellent way. While they stand still I cannot help remembering the solemn words of Obadiah to Edom: "Thou shouldest not have looked on in the day of calamity." (Obad. 13.) Unless I am greatly mistaken they will repent bitterly one day that they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty. It is but a small thing after all that we ask of them. We do not want them to give up their own cherished views, and join our school. But we do ask them, as honest Churchmen, to assist us in resisting Popery, and in maintaining undefiled the great principles of the English Reformation. The Church of England requires all her honest and loyal members to arise and do their duty. In a day like this, to do nothing is to be unfaithful to the Church.

Things look black in every direction, I freely admit. But there is no reason to despair. The day is not lost. As Napoleon said on a memorable occasion, "There is yet time to win a battle." Come what will, let us not desert our position. Let us not please our enemies by spiking our guns, and marching out of our fortress without a fight. Rather let us stand to our guns, like Latimer and Ridley, and in God's strength show a bold front to the foe. The Church of England has done some good in days gone by, and the Church is still worth preserving. If we fall in the struggle, let us fall with face to the foe and colours flying; but, like the gallant sentinel of Pompeii, who would not stir when Vesuvius was in eruption, let no man leave his post. My own mind is fully made up. I say the Church of England had better perish and go to pieces than forsake the principles of the Reformation, and tolerate the sacrifice of the mass and auricular confession. But whether she is to perish or not depends, under God, on the action of her members.

ABSOLUTION AND CONFESSION.

THE MIND OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

AS SHEWN IN THE HOMILIES

APPOINTED TO BE READ IN CHURCHES,

ESPECIALLY IN THE

"SECOND PART OF THE HOMILY ON REPENTANCE."

LONDON:
CHURCH ASSOCIATION,
14. BUCKINGHAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

1877.

ABSOLUTION AND CONFESSION.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

ARTICLE XXXV.—*Of the Homilies.*

“The Second Book of the Homilies, the several Titles whereof we have joined under this Article doth contain a *godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times*, as doth the former Book of Homilies which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and therefore we judge them to be read in the Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.”

HOMILY THE THIRTY-SECOND.

PART SECOND.

SECOND PART OF THE HOMILY ON REPENTANCE.

HITHERTO have ye heard, well-beloved, how needful and necessary the doctrine of repentance is, and how earnestly it is throughout all the Scriptures of God urged and set forth, both by the ancient prophets, by our Saviour Jesus Christ, and his apostles; and that forasmuch as it is the conversion or turning again of the whole man unto God, from whom we go away by sin, these four points ought to be observed; that is, from whence or from what things we must return; unto whom this our returning must be made; by whose means it ought to be done, that it may be effectual; and last of all, after what sort we ought to behave ourselves in the same, that it may be profitable unto us, and attain unto the thing that we do seek by it. Ye have also learned, that as the opinion of them that deny the benefit of repentance unto those, that, after they be come to God, and grafted in our Saviour Jesus Christ, do, through the frailness of their flesh and the temptation of the devil, fall into some grievous and detestable sin, is most pestilent and pernicious; so we must beware, that we do in no wise think that we are able of our own selves, and of our own strength, to return unto the Lord our God, from whom we are gone away by our wickedness and sin. Now it shall be declared unto you, what be the true parts of repentance, and what things ought to move us to repent, and to return unto the Lord our God with all speed.

Repentance (as it is said before) is a true returning unto God, whereby men, forsaking utterly their idolatry and wickedness, do with a lively faith embrace, love, and worship the true living God only, and give themselves to all manner of good works, which by God's word they know to be acceptable unto him.

There be four parts of repentance. Now there be four parts of repentance, which, being set together, may be likened to an easy and short ladder, whereby we may climb from the bottomless pit of perdition, that we cast ourselves into by our daily offences and grievous sins, up into the castle or tower of eternal and endless salvation.

The first is the contrition of the heart. For we must be earnestly sorry for our sins, and unfeignedly lament and bewail that we have by them so grievously offended our most bounteous and merciful God, who so tenderly loved us, that he gave his only begotten Son, to die a most bitter death, and to shed his dear heart-blood for our redemption and deliverance. And verily this inward sorrow and grief, being conceived in the heart for the heinousness of sin, if it be earnest and unfeigned, is as a sacrifice to God; as the holy prophet David doth testify, saying, *A sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit; a contrite and broken heart, O Lord, thou wilt not despise.* (Ps. li. 17.)

But that this may take place in us, we must be diligent to read and hear the Scriptures and word of God, which most lively do paint out before our eyes our natural uncleanness, and the enormity of our sinful life. For unless we have a thorough feeling of our sins, how can it be that we should earnestly be sorry for them? Before David did hear the word of the Lord by the mouth of the prophet Nathan, what heaviness, I pray you, was in him for the adultery and the murder that he had committed? so that it might be said right well, that he slept in his own sin. (2 Sam. xii. 1-13.) We read in the Acts of the Apostles, that, when the people had heard the sermon of Peter, they were compunct and *pricked in their hearts.* (Acts ii. 37.) Which thing would never have been, if they had not heard that wholesome sermon of Peter. They therefore that have no mind at all neither to read nor yet to hear God's word, there is but small hope of them, that they will as much as once set their feet, or take hold, upon the first staff or step of this ladder; but rather will sink deeper and deeper into the bottomless pit of perdition. For if at any time, through the remorse of their conscience, which accuseth them, they feel any inward grief, sorrow, or heaviness for their sins; forasmuch as they want the salve and comfort of God's word, which they do despise, it will be unto them rather a mean to bring them to utter desperation, than otherwise.

The second is, an unfeigned confession and acknowledging of our sins unto God, whom by them we have so grievously offended, that, if he should deal with us according to his justice, we do deserve a thousand hells, if there could be so many. Yet if we will with a sorrowful and contrite heart make an unfeigned confession of them unto God, he will freely and frankly forgive them, and so put all our wickedness out of remembrance before the sight of his majesty

that they shall no more be thought upon. (Ezek. xviii. 27.) Hereunto doth pertain the golden saying of the holy prophet David, where he saith on this manner, *Then I acknowledged my sin unto thee, neither did I hide mine iniquity: I said I will confess against myself my wickedness unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the ungodliness of my sin.* (Ps. xxxii. 5.) These are also the words of John the Evangelist; *If we confess our sins, God is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to make us clean from all our wickedness.* (1 John i. 9.) Which ought to be understood of the confession that is made unto God. For these are St. Augustine's words; "That confession which is made unto God is required by God's law; whereof John the apostle speaketh, saying, *If we confess our sins, God is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to make us clean from all our wickedness.* For without this confession, sin is not forgiven." This is then the chiefest and most principal confession that in the Scriptures and word of God we are bidden to make, and without the which we shall never obtain pardon and forgiveness of our sins.

Indeed, besides this there is another kind of confession, which is needful and necessary. And of the same doth St. James speak after this manner, saying, *Acknowledge your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be saved.* (James v. 16.) As if he should say, Open that which grieveth you, that a remedy may be found. And this is commanded both for him that complaineth, and for him that heareth, that the one should shew his grief to the other. The true meaning of it is, that the faithful ought to acknowledge their offences, whereby some hatred, rancour, grudge, or malice, have risen or grown among them one to another, that a brotherly reconciliation may be had, without the which nothing that we do can be acceptable unto God, as our Saviour Jesus Christ doth witness himself, saying, *When thou offerest thine offering at the altar, if thou rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thine offering, and go and be reconciled; and when thou art reconciled, come and offer thine offering.* (Matt. v. 23, 24.) It may also thus be taken, that we ought to confess our weakness and infirmities one to another, to the end that, knowing each other's frailness, we may the more earnestly pray together unto Almighty God, our heavenly Father, that he will vouchsafe to pardon us our infirmities, for his Son Jesus Christ's sake, and not to impute them unto us, when he shall render to every man according to his works.

Answer to the
adversaries,
which maintain
auricular con-
fession.

And whereas the adversaries go about to wrest this place, for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others: for if this text ought to be understood of auricular confession, then the priests are as much bound to confess themselves unto the lay-people, as the lay-people are bound to confess themselves to them. And if to pray is to absolve, then the laity by this place hath as great authority to absolve the priests, as the priests have to absolve the laity. This did Johannes Scotus, otherwise called Duns, well perceive,

who upon this place writeth on this manner; "Neither doōn it seem unto me that James did give this commandment, or that he did set it forth as being received of Christ. For first and foremost, whence had he authority to bind the whole church, sith that he was only bishop of the church of Jerusalem? Except thou wilt say, that the same church was at the beginning the head church, and consequently that he was the head bishop, which thing the see of Rome will never grant." The understanding of it then is as in these words; *Confess your sins one to another*: a persuasion to humility, whereby he willeth us to confess ourselves generally unto our neighbours, that we are sinners, according to this saying; *If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.* (1 John i. 8.)

And where that they do allege this saying of our Saviour Jesus Christ unto the leper to prove auricular confession to stand on God's word, *Go thy way, and shew thyself unto the priest* (Matt. viii. 4); do they not see that the leper was cleansed from his leprosy, before he was by Christ sent unto the priest for to show himself unto him? By the same reason we must be cleansed from our spiritual leprosy, I mean our sins must be forgiven us, before that we come to confession. What need we then to tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest, sith that they be already taken away?

Ambrose. Therefore holy Ambrose, in his second sermon upon the hundred and nineteenth psalm, doth say full well, *"Go shew thyself unto the priest.* Who is the true priest, but he which is the *priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedech.*" (Heb. vii. 17.) Whereby this holy father doth understand, that both the priesthood and the law being changed, we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ; who, being our sovereign Bishop, doth with the sacrifice of his body and blood, offered once for ever upon the altar of the cross, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins of all those that with true confession of the same do flee unto him. It is most evident and plain, that this auricular confession hath not the warrant of God's word, else it had not been lawful for Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, upon a just occasion to have put it down. For when any thing ordained of God is by the lewdness of men abused, the abuse ought to be taken away, and the thing itself suffered to remain. Moreover, these are St. Augustine's words, "What have I to do with men, that they should hear my confession, as though they were able to heal my diseases? A curious sort of men to know another man's life, and slothful to correct and amend their own. Why do they seek to hear of me what I am, which will not hear of thee what they are? And how can they tell, when they hear by me of myself, whether I tell the truth or not; sith that no mortal man knoweth what is in man, but the spirit of man which is in him?" Augustine would not have written thus, if auricular confession had been used in his time. Being therefore not led with the conscience thereof, let us with fear and trembling, and with a true contrite heart, use that kind of confession that God doth command in his word; and then doubtless

as he is faithful and righteous, he will forgive us our sins, and make us clean from all wickedness. I do not say, but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, and they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God's word : but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance.

The third part of repentance is faith, whereby we do apprehend and take hold upon the promises of God, touching the free pardon and forgiveness of our sins : which promises are sealed up unto us, with the death and blood-shedding of his Son Jesus Christ. For what should avail and profit us to be sorry for our sins, to lament and bewail that we have offended our most bounteous and merciful Father, or to confess and acknowledge our offences and trespasses, though it be done never so earnestly, unless we do steadfastly believe, and be fully persuaded, that God, for his Son Jesus Christ's sake, will forgive us all our sins, and put them out of remembrance, and from his sight ? Therefore they that teach repentance without a lively faith in our Saviour Jesus Christ, do teach none other but Judas' repentance, as all the

The repentance of the schoolmen.

schoolmen do, which do only allow these three parts of repentance ; the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the satisfaction of the work. But all these things we find in Judas'

Judas and his repentance.

repentance, which in outward appearance did far exceed and pass the repentance of Peter. For first and foremost, we read in the Gospel, that Judas was so sorrowful and heavy, yea that he was filled with such anguish and vexation of mind for that which he had done, that he could not abide to live any longer. Did not he also, before he hanged himself, make an open confession of his fault, when he said, *I have sinned, betraying the innocent blood ?* And verily this was a very bold confession, which might have brought him to great trouble. For by it he did lay to the high priests and elders' charge the shedding of innocent blood, and that they were most abominable murderers. He did also make a certain kind of satisfaction, when he did cast their money unto them again. (Matt. xxvii. 3-5.) No such thing do

Peter and his repentance.

we read of Peter, although he had committed a very heinous sin, and most grievous offence, in denying of his Master. We find that *he went out and wept bitterly* [Matt. xxvi. 75] ; whereof Ambrose speaketh on this manner ; " Peter was sorry and wept, because he erred as a man. I do not find what he said ; I know that he wept. I read of his tears, but not of his satisfaction." But how chance that the one was received into favour again with God, and the other cast away, but because that the one did, by a lively faith in him whom he had denied, take hold upon the mercy of God ; and the other wanted faith, whereby he did despair of the goodness and mercy of God ? It is evident and plain then, that although we be never so earnestly sorry for our sins, acknowledge and confess them ; yet all these things shall

be but means to bring us to utter desperation, except we do steadfastly believe that God our heavenly Father will, for his Son Jesus Christ's sake, pardon and forgive us our offences and trespasses, and utterly put them out of remembrance in his sight. Therefore, as we said before, they that teach repentance without Christ, and a lively faith in the mercy of God, do only teach Cain's or Judas' repentance.

The fourth is, an amendment of life, or a new life, in bringing forth fruits worthy of repentance. For they that do truly repent must be clean altered and changed, they must become new creatures, they must be no more the same that they were before. And therefore thus said John Baptist unto the Pharisees and Sadducees that came unto his baptism, *O generation of vipers, who hath forewarned you to flee from the anger to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance.* (Matt. iii. 7, 8.) Whereby we do learn, that, if we will have the wrath of God to be pacified, we must in no wise dissemble, but turn unto him again with a true and sound repentance, which may be known and declared by good fruits, as by most sure and infallible signs thereof.

They that do from the bottom of their hearts acknowledge their sins, and are unfeignedly sorry for their offences, will cast off all hypocrisy, and put on true humility, and lowliness of heart. They will not only receive the Physician of the soul, but also with a most fervent desire long for him. They will not only abstain from the sins of their former life, and from all other filthy vices, but also flee, eschew, and abhor all the occasions of them. And as they did before give themselves to uncleanness of life, so will they from henceforwards with all diligence give themselves to innocence, pureness of life, and true godliness.

We have the Ninevites for an example, which at the preaching of Jonas did not only proclaim a general fast, and that they should every one put on sackcloth, but they all did turn from their evil ways, and from the wickedness that was in their hands. (Jonas iii. 5, 10.) But above all other, the history of Zaccheus is most notable; for being come unto our Saviour Jesus Christ, he did say, *Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have defrauded any man or taken aught away by extortion, or fraud, I do restore him fourfold.* (Luke xix. 8.) Here we see that after his repentance, he was no more the man that he was before, but was clean changed and altered. It was so far off that he would continue and abide still in his unsatiable covetousness, or take aught away fraudulently from any man, that rather he was most willing and ready to give away his own, and to make satisfaction unto all them that he had done injury and wrong unto. Here may we right well add the sinful woman, which, when she came to our Saviour Jesus Christ, did pour down such abundance of tears out of those wanton eyes of hers, wherewith she had allured many unto folly, that she did with them wash his feet, wiping them with the hairs of her head, which she was wont most gloriously to set out, making of them a net of the devil. (Luke vii. 37, 38.)

Hereby we do learn, what is the satisfaction that God doth

require of us; which is, that we cease from evil, and do good [Isa. i. 16, 17]; and, if we have done any man wrong, to endeavour ourselves to make him true amends to the utmost of our power, following in this the example of Zaccheus, and of this sinful woman, and also that goodly lesson that John Baptist Zacharias' son, did give unto them that came to ask counsel of him. [Luke iii. 8 & *seq.*]. This was commonly the penance that Christ enjoined sinners; *Go thy way and sin no more.* (John v. 14: [viii. 11].) Which penance we shall never be able to fulfil, without the special grace of him that doth say, *Without me ye can do nothing.* (John xv. 5.) It is therefore our parts, if at least we be desirous of the health and salvation of our own selves, most earnestly to pray unto our heavenly Father, to assist us with his Holy Spirit, that we may be able to hearken unto the voice of the true Shepherd, and with due obedience to follow the same.

Let us hearken to the voice of Almighty God, when he calleth us to repentance; let us not harden our hearts, as such infidels do, who abuse the time given them of God to repent, and turn it to continue their pride and contempt against God and man; which know not how much they heap God's wrath upon themselves, for the hardness of their hearts, which cannot repent at the day of vengeance. Where we have offended the law of God, let us repent us of our straying from so good a Lord. Let us confess our unworthiness before him; but yet let us trust in God's free mercy for Christ's sake, for the pardon of the same. And from henceforth let us endeavour ourselves to walk in a new life, as new-born babes, whereby we may glorify our Father which is in heaven, and thereby to bear in our consciences a good testimony of our faith: so at the last, to obtain the fruition of everlasting life, through the merits of our Saviour: to whom be all praise and honour for ever. *Amen.*

[Extract from certain Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches in the time of the late Queen Elizabeth of famous Memory, with an Index of subjects and names, and a table of texts of Scripture. Suitable prayers and parallel passages from various works of authority. Published by the Prayer Book and Homily Society, Adam Street, Strand, London. 1852.]

ADDRESS BY THE COUNCIL.

THE CHURCH ASSOCIATION have been engaged for upwards of ten years in offering a determined opposition to the most serious, deeply laid, and resolute attempt that has ever been made to Romanize the Church of England. In prosecuting their labours they have had to endure misrepresentation and obloquy; but it has been the earnest endeavour of the Council to avoid "rendering railing for railing;" and they believe that they have never issued any official document which has transgressed the laws of courtesy or Christian charity. They have acted throughout under a deep conviction that they were engaged in a momentous struggle; that their controversy was not with individuals, but in defence of principles, and they are content to await the judgment of the future as to the value and importance of their labours in defence of the principles and order of the Established Church.

The time has now come when the Council think it right to submit to the Christian public a summary of what has been achieved, which will be found in the Appendix to this Address, containing decisions on no fewer than fifty-nine points in their favour, and which, without comment, will prove alike the importance and the success of their labours.

The Council are not unmindful of the extreme difficulty which exists of enforcing obedience on an educated, united, and resolute band of men to whose distorted imagination opposition to the laws of their Church and country has been magnified into a duty to God and who say in misapplied words of Scripture, "we ought to obey God rather than men." It is by no means impossible that their threats will be realized and that a large number of clergymen will continue to practise the rites and usages which have been authoritatively condemned, and that the remonstrances of their Bishops will be treated with the same contempt as the judgments

of the Ecclesiastical Courts. But the friends of Protestantism must not be alarmed at this "as if some strange thing had happened." Many of the most salutary laws for the social and moral welfare of the community have at the outset been resisted with equal pertinacity by those interested in opposing them, and great ingenuity has constantly been exerted in devising means to evade the law and to escape punishment, but in the end the honour of the law has been vindicated.

A fair review of the history of our own and other countries leads to the conclusion that disobedience to law almost necessarily tends to demoralize those who are guilty of it, by creating around them an atmosphere destructive to spiritual life and godliness. It is not indeed to be denied for a moment that resistance to injustice and oppression has in every age been productive of good results; and the Council are well aware that the best and most devout of their opponents endeavour to satisfy their consciences by fostering the delusion that they are martyrs and confessors; but a careful comparison of their position and conduct with that of the true champions for truth and liberty must convince every candid mind, and will, it is hoped, soon convince the more honest and reasonable of the party, that they are not entitled to claim this condonation for their grievous misconduct. The simple truth is that the leaders in this movement, so far from being Patriots and Martyrs, have justly laid themselves open to the charge of having adopted as their watchwords, "disloyalty to their Church: disobedience to their Bishops; and defiance of their country's laws."

The one object of the Council throughout these protracted legal investigations, prayerfully undertaken under a deep and solemn sense of duty, has been, with the blessing of God, to preserve to our land the true principles of the Gospel and the simplicity of Scriptural worship as embodied in the Formularies and Liturgy of the National Church. The law has now been ascertained, and the views held by the Church Association and their friends respecting the Reformed Ritual of our Church, as settled three centuries ago, have been fully vindicated.

It is a national adage that "England expects every man to do his duty," and as the Judgments obtained are not the property of the Church Association but of the whole nation, the Council now respectfully call upon all office bearers in the Church of England to consider the duties which they have solemnly undertaken to fulfil, with a view to their efficient discharge.

The following are some of the plain and self-evident duties of loyal Churchmen in this crisis, namely—

BISHOPS.

- 1.—May exclude from ordination those who declare beforehand their unwillingness to obey the Law.
- 2.—May withdraw the Licences of Curates who assist in illegal acts.
- 3.—May refuse to consecrate places of worship when illegal ornaments are intruded.
- 4.—May take proceedings under the Church Discipline Act.
- 5.—May facilitate the proceedings of aggrieved Parishioners.
- 6.—May issue Monitions and enforce them by Ecclesiastical Punishments.

ARCHDEACONS.

- 7.—May take proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act.
- 8.—Must present to the Bishop all illegal acts of which they have received notice from the Churchwardens.

Extract from the Archdeacon's Articles of Enquiry.

Are the services of the Church duly and properly performed as prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer or other lawful authority?

Have you any presentment to make respecting the Services of the Church, the performance of the duties of the Clergy or Officers of the Church, or respecting any matter which in your judgment ought to be brought under the cognizance of the Ordinary?

CHURCHWARDENS.

- 9.—In addition to their rights as Parishioners, are bound to make an Annual Presentment to the Archdeacon, of all illegal acts done in the Parish Church.
- 10.—May apply for a faculty to remove any unlawful ornament or article from the church.
- 11.—One Churchwarden may take proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act.

The following Declaration is signed by Churchwardens.

We declare that we will truly and faithfully and to the best of our skill and knowledge execute the office of Churchwarden within our Parish, and that we will present such Persons and Things as are presentable by the Laws Ecclesiastical of this Realm.

PARISHIONERS.

- 12.—May make earnest efforts to secure the election of Protestant Churchwardens.
- 13.—Three of them may unite to take proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act for breaches of the Law.

ABSTRACT OF POINTS DECIDED IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

The following Vestments, Ceremonies, and Ornaments of the Church have been pronounced illegal by the Ecclesiastical Courts:—

- a. b. d. g. 1. Chasubles worn by the Ministers.
- a. b. d. g. 2. Albs
- e. 3. Albs with patches called Apparels.
- e. 4. Cope at Morning or Evening Prayer.
- a. 5. Tunics or Tunicles at the Communion Service.
- e. 6. Tippetts of a circular form.
- e. 7. Stoles, whether black, white, or coloured.
- e. 8. Dalmatics at the Communion Service.
- e. 9. Maniples worn by the Ministers.
- f. 10. Biretta.

- e. d. e. f. g.* 11. Ceremonially mixing water with the wine used in the Administration of the Holy Communion.
- a. f.* 12. The Administration of Wine mixed with Water to the Communicants at the Lord's Supper.
- a. b. d. g.* 13. The Administration of Wafers instead of Bread at the Holy Communion.

- a. See Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on Appeal from the Court of Arches in *Hebbert v. Purchas* (1871).
- b. Ditto Ditto, *Ridsdale v. Clifton* (1877).
- c. Ditto Ditto, *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868).
- d. Judgment of the Dean of Arches (Sir Robert Phillimore) in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868-1874).
- e. Ditto Ditto (Sir Robert Phillimore) *Elphinstone v. Purchas*.
- f. Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Hudson and others v. Tooth*.
- g. Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Clifton v. Ridsdale*.

- a. b. d. g.* 14. The Minister interposing his body while consecrating the elements so as intentionally to hide the manual acts from the sight of the bulk of the people.
- c. e. f. g.* 15. Kneeling and prostration before the Consecrated Elements during the Prayer of Consecration.
- e.* 16. The use of sanctus and sacring bells rung during the Prayer of Consecration.
- f.* 17. Tolling of the great bell of the church during the Prayer of Consecration.
- f. g.* 18. Consecrating and receiving the Elements when less than three persons Communicated.
- d. e. f. g.* 19. Introduction of the "Agnus Dei," in the Service when not authorized.
- d.* 20. Sign of the Cross, made by the Minister:—
- f.* During the saying of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.
- f.* At the pronouncing of the Absolution in the Communion Service.
- e. f.* When about to Consecrate the Elements.
- f.* At the giving of the Sacrament to the Communicants.
- f.* During the pronouncing of the Benediction.
- d. e.* 21. Kissing the Prayer Book before reading the Gospel.
- c. d. e. f.* 22. Elevation during the Prayer of Consecration of the Paten and Cup.
- e.* 23. Elevation of the Bread or Wafer.
- c. e.* 24. Elevation of the Offertory Alms, and removing them to the Credence Table instead of suffering them to remain on the Communion Table.
- e.* 25. Leaving the Communion Table uncovered on Good Friday.

-
- a.* See Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on Appeal from the Court of Arches in *Hibbert v. Purchas* (1871).
- b.* Ditto Ditto, *Ridsdale v. Clifton* (1877).
- c.* Ditto Ditto, *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868).
- d.* Judgment of the Dean of Arches (Sir Robert Phillimore) in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868-1874).
- e.* Ditto Ditto (Sir Robert Phillimore) *Elphinstone v. Purchas*.
- f.* Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Hudson and others v. Tooth*.
- g.* Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Clifton v. Ridsdale*.

- 5
- e. 26. Standing in front of the middle of the Communion Table with back to the people, while reading the Collects next before the Epistle.
 - e. f. 27. Standing with back to the people, while reading the Epistle.
 - f. 28. Ditto, ditto, while reading the Gospel.
 - e. 29. Standing at the foot of the Communion Table with back to the people, while reading the Collects after the Creed at Evening Prayer.
 - e. 30. Ministers attended by Acolytes and person holding a Crucifix, while reading the Gospel.
 - e. 31. Te Deum, sung at the Communion Table, immediately after Evening Service, with Crucifix and banners about the Minister.
 - d. 32. Processions, with Vestments unauthorized to be worn, with Crucifix on a pole, and Banners.
 - e. f. g. 33. A Procession, immediately before or after Service, singing a hymn, and composed of—persons carrying and swinging incense; carrying Crucifix; Attendants with lighted candles; Deacons or others with banners; Choristers dressed in red and white; Persons in cassock and cotta, with blue tippet; Clergy and other persons in copes.
 - e. 34. Palms, Lighted Candles, and Crucifix, carried in procession at, and as a Ceremony connected with, Divine Service.
 - e. 35. Blessing of Palms and giving them to the people during Divine Service on Palm Sunday.
 - e. 36. Blessing of Candles and giving them to the people during Divine Service on the day of the Purification of the Virgin Mary (Candlemas Day).
 - e. 37. Blessing of Ashes and rubbing the powder on the foreheads of Members of the congregation on Ash Wednesday.

d. Judgment of the Dean of Arches (Sir Robert Phillimore) in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868-1874).

- e. Ditto Ditto (Sir Robert Phillimore) *Elphinstone v. Purchas*.
- f. Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Hudson and others v. Tooth*.
- g. Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Clifton v. Ridsdale*.

- c. e. g.* 38. Using lighted candles on the Communion Table during the celebration of the Holy Communion, when such candles were not wanted for the purpose of giving light.
- d.* 39. Using lighted candles at Morning Prayer before the Holy Communion.
- f.* 40. Permitting attendants, in cassocks and surplices, to elevate candles at points in the Communion Service.
- e.* 41. Candles, lighted, when not wanted for the purpose of giving light, and used in any of the ways following, during Divine Service:—
- e.* „ Carried on Candlemas Day and Whitsun-Day.
- e.* „ Used at reading of the Gospel.
- e. f.* „ Placed on the Communion Table or on a ledge over it, and seeming to be part of it, or about or before the Communion-table, either during the Communion Service or other parts of the Morning Service.
- e.* „ Paschal light at Easter.
- d. e.* 42. Using incense during the celebration of the Holy Communion.
- e. f.* 43. Using incense for censuring persons or things or burnt ceremonially, in or immediately before Divine Service and as subsidiary thereto.
- e.* 44. Notices of High Celebrations and of Feasts not directed by the Church to be observed.
- e.* 45. Notice of Mortuary Celebration for the repose of a Sister.
- e.* 46. Interpolation while reading the Communion Service, after the Collect for the Queen, of a Prayer, Epistle and Gospel, not in the Prayer Book, read at a Mortuary Celebration.
- c.* 47. Admission of a Choir Boy, with certain ceremonies immediately before Service.

- c.* See Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on Appeal from the Court of Arches in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868).
- d.* Judgment of the Dean of Arches (Sir Robert Phillimore) in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868-1874).
- e.* Ditto Ditto (Sir Robert Phillimore) *Elphinstone v. Purchas*.
- f.* Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Hudson and others v. Tooth*.
- g.* Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Clifton v. Ridsdale*.

- e.* 48. Metal Crucifix, not part of architectural decorations, on or in apparent connection with the Communion Table, and seeming to be part of its furniture, covered and uncovered ceremonially.
- e.* 49. Bowing and doing reverence to the Crucifix during Divine Service.
- e.* 50. Censing the Crucifix.
- k.* 51. Ceremonially washing, rinsing, and wiping the Communion Cup.

ILLEGAL ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

- e.* 52. Placing a Figure of the Infant Saviour with lilies over the credence-table at Christmas.
- e.* 53. Placing a Stuffed Dove over the Communion Table on Whitsun-Day.
- b. g.* 54. Crucifix at the top of a Rood Screen.
- g.* 55. Representations of figures forming what are called "Stations of the Cross."
- f.* 56. Introducing without a faculty a second Communion Table besides the Communion Table in the chancel.
- f.* 57. Introducing a large Crucifix several feet high over the nave near the pulpit.
- f.* 58. Introducing upon the Communion Table, or on a ledge above and behind the same, images or figures with gilt wings.
- h.* 59. A Cross on or so placed as to appear connected with the Communion Table.
- i.* 60. A Baldacchino over the Communion Table.

b. See Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on Appeal from the Court of Arches in *Ridsdale v. Clifton*.

- e.* Ditto Ditto (Sir Robert Phillimore) *Elphinstone v. Purchas*.
- f.* Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Hudson and others v. Tooth*.
- g.* Ditto Ditto (Lord Penzance) *Clifton v. Ridsdale*.
- h.* Ditto Ditto in *Durst v. Marsters* (1876).

i. Judgment of the Consistory Court of London in the case of the Vicar and Churchwardens of the Parish of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, *v. Bowron*.

k. Judgment of the Dean of Arches in *Dean and others v. the Rev. S. F. Green* (Miles Platting), 1879.

CHURCH ARMOUR.

A SHORT CATECHISM FOR YOUNG CHURCHMEN,
CHIEFLY ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

BY THE REV. W. F. TAYLOR, D.D.,
VICAR OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S, EVERTON, LIVERPOOL.

The following Catechism, written by the Rev. Dr. Taylor, is in use in several schools in Liverpool, where hundreds of children are learning it. The Catechism will be found very valuable in familiarizing the minds of young people with the text of the XXXIX Articles, and furnishing them with answers in the very words of the Church to important questions now raised.

Q. (1) Who made you ?

A. "God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible."—(*Nicene Creed*; *Gen.* i. 1, 26; *Job* xxxiii. 4; *Heb.* xi. 3.)

Q. (2) Are there more Gods than one ?

A. No. "There is but one living and true God, everlasting, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness."—(*Art.* I; *Mark* xii. 32; *Neh.* ix. 6; *Jer.* x. 10.)

Q. (3) How many Persons are there in the Godhead ?

A. Three; "in the unity of this Godhead there are three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."—(*Art.* I; *Matt.* xxviii. 19; *2 Cor.* xiii. 14; *John* i. 1; *Acts* v. 3, 4.)

Q. (4) Who is Jesus Christ ?

A. Jesus Christ is "the Son of God, who took man's nature"

upon Him, and "was born of the Virgin Mary; He truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried."—(*Art. II: Gal. iv. 4; John i. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18.*)

Q. (5) Why did the Son of God become man, and suffer on the Cross?

A. The Son of God became man, and suffered in order "to reconcile His Father to us, and be a sacrifice for all the sins of men."—(*Art. II; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 19; Heb. ix. 26; 1 John ii. 2.*)

Q. (6) Where did the soul of Christ go when He was crucified?

A. The soul of Christ went to the invisible world (Hades or Hell), and to that part of it called Paradise.—(*Art. III; Acts ii. 27; Luke xxiii. 43.*)

Q. (7) Did Christ's soul remain in the invisible world, and His body in the grave?

A. No; "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day."—(*Art. IV; 1 Cor. xv. 4; Mark xvi. 19; 1 Thess. iv. 16.*)

Q. (8) Who is the Holy Ghost?

A. The Holy Ghost is the third Person of the blessed Trinity; "proceeding from the Father and the Son, and is very and eternal God."—(*Art. V; John xiv. 26; Acts v. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 10.*)

Q. (9) What is the Rule of Faith?

A. The Rule of Faith is The Bible only or "Holy Scripture, which containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."—(*Art. VI; Isa. viii. 20; 2 Tim. iii. 15; John v. 39; Deut. xii. 32; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.*)

Q. (10) Is the Old Testament contrary to the New?

A. No. "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man."—(*Art. VII; Heb. i. 1, 2; Luke xxiv. 44; Acts xxvi. 22; Rom. xvi. 26.*)

Q. (11) What are the three Creeds?

A. The Three Creeds are, "The Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed."—(*Art. VIII.*)

Q. (12) Why should we believe these three Creeds?

A. Because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."—(*Art. VIII; 2 Tim. i. 13.*)

Q. (13) What is original sin?

A. "Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man naturally descended from Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil."—(*Art. IX; Ps. li. 5; Rom. iii. 10-12; viii. 7.*)

Q. (14) Is Man able to turn to God of himself?

A. No. "The condition of man after the fall is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God."—(*Art. X; John vi. 44; xv. 5; Eph. ii. 1.*)

Q. (15) What do we need in order to turn to God?

A. In order to turn to God, we need "the grace of God by Christ preventing us (*i.e.* going before us), that we may have a good will; and working with us, when we have that good will."—(*Art. X; Jer. xxxi. 18, 19; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Phil. ii. 13.*)

Q. (16) What is the true doctrine of Justification?

A. That "we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings."—(*Art. XI; Rom. iii. 24, 25; v. 1, 9, 19; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9.*)

Q. (17) What are good works?

A. "Good works are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification. They spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, so that by them a lively (*i.e.* living) faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by its fruit."—(*Art. XII; Phil. i. 11; John xv. 4, 5; Gal. v. 6.*)

Q. (18) Are works done before justification good works?

A. No. Works done before justification are not properly good works, "nor are they pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ."—(*Art. XIII; Isa. lxiv. 6; Luke xviii. 11-14.*)

Q. (19) What are works of Supererogation?

A. Works of Supererogation are "Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments. These cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety."—(*Art. XIV; Luke x. 27; xvii. 10.*)

Q. (20) Was the Virgin Mary, or any of the Apostles or Prophets free from sin?

A. No. "Christ alone was without sin. All we the rest offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."—(*Art. XV; Luke i. 47; 1 John i. 8.*)

Q. (21) What is Election or Predestination?

A. "Election to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby

He hath constantly decreed to deliver from wrath those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation."—(*Art. XVII*; *Eph.* i. 4; *1 Pet.* i. 2; *Rom.* viii. 29, 30.)

Q. (22) Can men be saved by the Law or Sect which they profess, if sincere in their obedience thereto?

A. No. "Man cannot be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, for Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved."—(*Art. XVIII*; *John* iii. 36; *xiv.* 6; *Acts* iv. 12.)

Q. (23) What is the visible Church?

A. "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."—(*Art. XIX*; *Acts* ii. 41, 42, 47; *1 Cor.* xi. 23-25; *1 Tim.* iii. 15.)

Q. (24) What authority hath the Church?

A. "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another."—(*Art. XX*; *Acts* xv. 2, 23; *xvi.* 4; *1 Cor.* xiv. 26, 40; *Gal.* i. 8.)

Q. (25) Can any particular Church err?

A. Yes. "The Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith."—(*Art. XIX*; *Rom.* xi. 20-22; *Rev.* ii. 14, 16, 20.)

Q. (26) Are General Councils infallible?

A. No. "General Councils are not infallible, and forasmuch as they are an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God."—(*Art. XXI*; *Acts* xx. 29, 30.)

Q. (27) Why should we reject the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, (*i.e.* Indulgences,) Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints?

A. Because it is "a fond thing vainly invented, grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."—(*Art. XXII*; *Luke* xxiii. 43; *Isa.* xliii. 25; *Ex.* xx. 4; *2 Kings* xviii. 4; *Rev.* xix. 10.)

Q. (28) Is it lawful for any man to take upon himself the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments?

A. No. "It is not lawful for any man to take upon himself the

office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same.”—(*Art. XXIII*; *Jer.* xxiii. 21; *Mark* iii. 14; *1 Tim.* v. 22; *2 Tim.* ii. 2.)

Q. (29) May the public worship of the Church be in a tongue not understood by the people—say in the Latin tongue?

A. Certainly not; for “it is plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church.”—(*Art. XXIV*; *1 Cor.* xiv. 11, 19, 28.)

Q. (30) What is a Sacrament?

A. A Sacrament is an “outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.”—(*Catechism*; *Acts* x. 47; *1 Cor.* x. 16.)

Q. (31) How many Sacraments has Christ ordained in His Church?

A. Two only; *i.e.*, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.—(*Catechism*; *Matt.* xxviii. 19; *Luke* xxii. 19, 20.)

Q. (32) What are the five additional sacraments of the Church of Rome?

A. The five additional sacraments of the Church of Rome are, “Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction.”—(*Art. XXV.*)

Q. (33) Why are “those five commonly called sacraments not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel”?

A. “Because they have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, and partly are states of life allowed in the Scripture; but yet have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.”—(*Art. XXV.*)

Q. (34) What is meant by the “Sacrament of Penance”?

A. A sacrament in which, it is said, “Sins are forgiven, by the priest’s absolution, joined with contrition, confession, and satisfaction.”—(*Abridg. Christ. Doc.*, p. 19.)

Q. (35) Why is this doctrine to be rejected?

A. Because repentance and faith are the only conditions of forgiveness appointed by God.—(*Mark* i. 15; *Luke* xxiv. 47; *Acts* x. 43; xiii. 38; xx. 21; *Rom.* iii. 25.)

Q. (36) Were the sacraments ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or carried about?

A. Certainly not; “but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome

effect or operation.”—(*Art. XXV*; *Mark xvi. 16*; *1 Cor. xi. 27.*)

Q. (37) Are all duly ordained ministers good men, and sound in the faith?

A. By no means; for, “In the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments.”—(*Art. XXVI*; *Matt. vii. 15*; *xiii. 25-30*; *Acts xx. 29, 30*; *2 Pet. ii. 1.*)

Q. (38) What is the Sacrament of Baptism?

A. “Baptism is a sign of Christian profession, and also a sign of regeneration, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive it rightly are grafted into the Church; and the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed.”—(*Art. XXVII*; *Rom. vi. 4*; *Gal. iii. 26, 27*; *Rom. iv. 11*; *Acts xxii. 16.*)

Q. (39) Is Infant Baptism lawful?

A. Certainly; as “most agreeable with the institution of Christ.”—(*Art. XXVII*; *Gen. xvii. 10*; *Mark x. 14*; *Acts xvi. 15, 33*; *1 Cor. vii. 14.*)

Q. (40) What is the Lord’s Supper?

A. “The Lord’s Supper is a sign of Christian love, and also a sacrament of our redemption by Christ’s death.”—(*Art. XXVIII*; *1 Cor. x. 16, 17*; *xi. 24, 25.*)

Q. (41) What is Transubstantiation?

A. “Transubstantiation is the (supposed) change of the substance of bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord.”—(*Art. XXVIII.*)

Q. (42) Why is the doctrine of Transubstantiation to be rejected?

A. Transubstantiation is to be rejected because “it cannot be proved by Holy Writ, is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.”—(*Art. XXVIII*; *1 Cor. xi. 26*; *Acts iii. 21*; *John vi. 62, 63*; *Acts xix. 26.*)

Q. (43) How is the Body of Christ received and eaten in the Supper?

A. “The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith”; for, “the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here.”—*Art. XXVIII. and Decl. Com. Service*. *John vi. 35, 63*; *Acts iii. 21*; *1 Cor. v. 7 8.*)

Q. (44) Do such as are void of a living faith partake of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament ?

A. Certainly not. "Such as are void of a living faith are in no wise partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."—(*Art. XXIX*; *John* xiii. 27; *1 Cor.* xi. 27-29; *Heb.* xi. 6.)

Q. (45) Should the minister alone drink the Cup ?

A. By no means. "The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay people."—(*Art. XXX*; *1 Cor.* x. 17; xi. 26.)

Q. (46) Is there any repetition or continuation of the sacrifice of Christ in the Lord's Supper ?

A. No. There is neither repetition, continuation, or renewal of the sacrifice of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but only the commemoration of "the one oblation of Christ, once made and finished upon the Cross."—(*Art. XXXI*; *1 Cor.* xi. 24; *Heb.* ix. 28; x. 10-12, 14, 18.)

Q. (47) What then are the sacrifices of Masses ?

A. "The sacrifices of Masses in which it is commonly said, that the priest offers Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, are blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."—(*Art. XXXI*; *Heb.* x. 1, 2, 11; *2 Pet.* ii. 1-3.)

Q. (48) Is the doctrine of Clerical celibacy according to the Scripture ?

A. No; for "Bishops, Priests (*i.e.*, Presbyters), and Deacons are not commanded by God's law to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage."—(*Art. XXXII*; *1 Cor.* ix. 5; *1 Tim.* iii. 2; iv. 1-3.)

Q. (49) Is it necessary that the Traditions (Customs) and Ceremonies of the Church be always the same ?

A. No; "it is not necessary they should be in all places one; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word."—(*Art. XXXIV*; *1 Cor.* xiv. 26, 40.)

Q. (50) Is it right for any one to break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church by his own private judgment ?

A. No. He that doth so "ought to be rebuked openly, that others may fear to do the like."—(*Art. XXXIV*; *1 Tim.* v. 20; *Kom.* xvi. 17, 18.)

Q (51) How should we esteem the Book of Homilies put forth by the Church of England ?

A. As containing "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, and therefore to be read in Churches, diligently-

and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.”—(*Art. XXXV*; 2 *Tim.* i. 13; 1 *Tim.* iv. 13.)

Q. (52) Is the Ordinal of the Church of England to be received by us?

A. Most certainly; for it “hath nothing that of itself is superstitious and ungodly; and therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according thereto we judge to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated or ordered.”—(*Art. XXXVI*; *John* xx. 21-23; *Luke* xxiv. 47; 2 *Cor.* v. 18, 19.)

Q. (53) How many orders of Ministers are there in the Church of England?

A. Three. For “it is evident to all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s Church; Bishops, Priests (*i.e.* Presbyters), and Deacons.”—(*Phil.* i. 1; 1 *Tim.* iii. 1, 10; v. 19-22; *Titus* i. 5; *Pref. to Ordination Serv.*)

Q. (54) What is meant by the Royal Supremacy?

A. That “the Queen’s majesty has the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, and should rule all estates and degrees committed to her charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal.”—(*Art. XXXVII*; 2 *Chron.* xxiv. 5; *Isa.* xlix. 23; 2 *Chron.* xxxi. 2; xxxv. 1, 2; *Ezra* vii. 27; *Rom.* xiii. 1.)

Q. (55) Should the supremacy of the Pope be admitted?

A. By no means; for “the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.” Nor is he the Vicar of Christ or successor of Peter, but rather is by many believed to be the predicted “Man of Sin,” who should sit in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.—(*Art. XXXVII*; *Preface to English Bible, Auth. Verz.* 1611; *Canons of 1606*; 2 *Thess.* ii. 3, 4.)

**THE RIDSDALE JUDGMENT: THE TESTIMONY IT
AFFORDS TO THE PROTESTANT CHARACTER
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.**

BY THE REV. G. W. WELDON, M.A.,
VICAR OF ST. SAVIOUR'S, CHELSEA.

Paper read at the Conference of the Church Association, held at
St. James's Hall, on the 14th June, 1877.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

IN undertaking to offer some observations on the testimony given to the Protestant character of the Church of England by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in their Judgment on the appeal in the Folkestone Ritual Case (*Ridsdale v. Clifton*), I begin by expressing my belief that, quite irrespective of this Judgment, the Protestantism of our National Church has been all through its past history and policy since the epoch of the Reformation, abundantly manifest.

The protesting Articles of the Church—her appeal in every instance to Scripture—the chastened fervour of her Communion Service—the whole framework of her Liturgy, from which are discarded all petitions to Saints or Angels, and through which prayer is addressed and worship offered only to the Triune God—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,—and still further, the Homilies of the Church, containing “godly and wholesome doctrine,” in which the leading errors of the Romish Church and her entire system of sensuous worship are authoritatively condemned, with a power of argument and emphasis of expression which leave nothing to be desired—all these forbid the entertainment of the slightest doubt by any intelligent or unprejudiced mind, as to the Protestantism of the Church of England. When to this it is added that the great fundamental laws (by which the English Church has been established), as set forth in the memorable year of 1688, when the nation was referred to in the Bill of Rights as “This Protestant Kingdom” stamp indelibly upon it the distinctive name and character of true Protestantism.

Even those outside the pale of the National Establishment must admit the impossibility of denying the fact, that however the Church may be assailed either from within or from without, by secret intrigue or by open hostility, it still bears on its very front the signs

and tokens that it is the Church of the Reformation, and therefore, is in direct antagonism to the false pretensions and arrogant assumptions of the Church of Rome.

Our position as a National Church is invulnerable, if only we manfully and faithfully stand by our Protestant and Evangelical principles. I have no fear whatever for the stability of the Church of England, if only it receives consistent testimony and honest support from those who, when entering upon the sacred office of the Ministry, have undertaken by the most solemn oaths that can bind man to his Maker, "to be ready, God helping them, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." It is to the neglect of this responsibility that the real mischief must be traced. From among our own selves have arisen men teaching perverse things—not sparing the flock—beguiling unstable souls by introducing another Gospel, which neutralizes the efficacy of the finished work of Christ, and negatives the entire system of true religion, which the Holy Spirit has revealed to us in the pages of the New Testament. We are confronted by men who, while they loudly profess devotion to the Church of England, are, nevertheless, with perverse ingenuity, doing all that in them lies to disparage her character, to undo the work of our Reformers, and to throw discredit upon her testimony by denying that she has any claim whatever to the title of Protestant.

Amid the varying alternations of the Church's history since the sixteenth century to the present period, there is no fact more incontrovertibly true than the persistent protest which she has made against the errors and corruptions of the Papacy; and over and over again she has recorded by plain and perhaps at times somewhat stern declarations her dislike and repugnance to the extravagant and garish Ritual, as well as the unscriptural doctrines of the Church of Rome.

It is not, therefore, on the ground of evidence being needed as to the essentially Protestant character of the Church that the present Judgment will be referred to in this paper; but simply as being a remarkable corroboration of a well-known fact, most important to be considered by the whole community, as set forth by high judicial authority—not in the heat of polemical controversy, but with such a display of calm reasoning as has induced the High Church journal of the widest influence to urge on its readers the acceptance of the Judgment as a settlement of the questions at issue.

It is a ground of thankfulness, therefore, that though this Judgment was not needed to strengthen the convictions of true Churchmen as to the essential Protestantism of the Church of England, it must have great weight with the general public; and surely we ought to be glad to carry along with us in this great struggle for the Protestantism of our Church and nation, the sympathies of the entire Christian people of the kingdom, whether belonging to our own or other Protestant communities, in which the great truths of the Reformation are maintained, and Sacred Scripture is appealed to as the rule of faith and practice.

PROTESTANTISM THE GREAT LEADING CHARACTERISTIC OF THE CHURCH ACCORDING TO LAW.

As it seems of vital importance that the real character of our Church should be thoroughly understood by the people, and as the bearings of this Judgment may be rendered more plain by a survey of her position, not only as a religious body, but also as a National Establishment, I venture to make the following brief statement on the subject.

1. And first, I feel bound to declare that not only is the Church herself essentially Protestant in setting forth plainly and distinctly the affirmative truths of the Gospel, together with Scriptural testimony against Papal error and superstition; but that it is for this special reason that the Church has been connected with the Throne and Constitution of the country, and has formed no small part of the life of the nation—of a nation whose greatness, influence, and prosperity since the epoch of the glorious Reformation, have been unrivalled in the history of the world. I repeat, the Church of England has been established on account of her Protestantism, of which the following will be undeniable proofs.

In the Act for a Union of the two Kingdoms of England and Scotland (5th Queen Anne, cap. viii. A.D. 1705-6), we find these remarkable words:—"And whereas it is reasonable and necessary that THE TRUE PROTESTANT RELIGION, professed and established by law in the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof should be effectually and unalterably secured," &c. &c. It is there enacted that Acts ratifying the Formularies of the Church, and "all and singular other Acts of Parliament now in force for the establishment and preservation of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline and government thereof, shall remain and be in full force for ever."

And here it is important to observe that for a similar reason the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was established as teaching "THE TRUE PROTESTANT RELIGION" and acts ratifying her "Confession of Faith" and purity of Worship were confirmed, ratified and approved in the same great statute which blended the Parliaments of England and Scotland into one, under one Protestant Sovereign taking and subscribing one common Coronation Oath.

2. It is also worthy of remark that the words in the Coronation Oath, whereby Her Majesty stands pledged to maintain to the utmost of her power "the Protestant religion established by law," refer to the Presbyterian Church north of the Tweed, as well as to the Episcopalian Church at this side of it; in addition to which the inviolable preservation of the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the English Church is guaranteed by the oath.

It may be said, and with truth, that the same law guaranteed the preservation of the Irish Church, but although Parliament thought fit to pass a measure, to the deep regret of many, for severing the connection between that Church and the State, it does not weaken the argument as to the Protestantism of the English Church,

while it gives the warning of great dangers confronting her, in case she should at any time, or for any reason, unhappily forfeit the good will of the community at large.

3. In the Act of Union with Ireland (A.D. 1800) the United Church of England was termed "a Protestant Episcopal Church," and in the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829 it was called "the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland," while the Scottish Church was described as "the Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland." This being so, there can be no possible ground for doubting that the express legal title of our Church—the title by which her rights, prerogatives, and property have been secured—her title, I will add, to the support, sympathy, and good will of the Christian people of the Realm, is that of the good old Protestant Church of England.

These remarks are intended to clear away the mists and vapours which occasionally tend to obscure the real character of the English Church, and of her allegiance with a State not only holding Protestant principles itself, but making the tenure of the Crown of this mighty Empire to depend upon the Sovereign's maintenance of the same.

THE FOUR POINTS DECIDED BY THE JUDGMENT IN THE FOLKESTONE CASE.

And now with respect to the late Judgment in the Folkestone Ritual case on the four points of the Eastward Position, Wafer-bread, setting up a Crucifix, and Sacrificial Vestments, my purpose is first to consider the two least satisfactory decisions, though even from these it will be seen that the distinctive Protestant character of the Church stands out in bold relief in such a way as must convince all candid and unbiassed minds.

At the outset I would remark that so far from the decisions with regard to the Eastward Position and the use of Wafer Bread giving satisfaction to the Ritualistic party, they have only increased their apprehensions of coming difficulties. They feel that according to this Judgment on these points, if a Ritualistic clergyman were so to stand "before the people" as to shut out from their view his ordering of the elements of the Lord's Supper, his doing so would be a decidedly illegal act, and such an act would be an almost inevitable consequence of his turning his back to them at the Lord's Table. Again, if Wafers used at the Holy Communion could be proved not to come under the designation of "Bread such as is usual to be eaten"—which it is well known the Wafer Bread is not—the use of them would be without any manner of doubt unlawful. And here the "*fas est et ab hoste doceri*" principle comes in; for we find that the Ritualistic paper most closely connected with the "English Church Union," and which would have been only too anxious to make the most of any seeming advantage (however infinitesimal or evanescent it might be) accruing from any halting remarks in the Judgment, has declared, in its impression of June 2nd with reference

to it, that "IT DOES NOT tolerate the Eastward Position as such." Now this is an unmistakable though reluctant testimony that there is no sacrificial offering in the Communion Service of the Church of England. The same paper (*The Church Review*) adds that "It (the Judgment) emphatically condemns Wafer Bread." What language could be stronger? What testimony wrung from an unwilling witness could be more decisive that this concomitant of the Romish Mass has no place in the Protestant Church of England? We have the accused himself confessing it. Out of his own mouth the advocate of Ritualism stands condemned.

THE SACRIFICIAL, OR EASTWARD POSITION.

The question of what is called "the Eastward Position" came before the Judicial Committee in the case of Mr. Ridsdale, who was charged with saying the Prayer of Consecration "with his back to the people, so that the people could not see him break the bread, or take the cup in his hand." The Committee, interpreting the latter words in the Rubric "that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people," to mean "in sight of the people," said, that "they were not prepared to hold that a penal charge was established against the Appellant merely by the proof that he stood, while saying the Prayer of Consecration, at the West side of the Communion Table, *without further evidence* that the people could not, in the sense in which their Lordships have used the words, *see him* break the bread, or take the cup in his hand." And in the final decision of the Court, the reason given for not condemning Mr. Ridsdale on this point was that "it is not established to their satisfaction that the Appellant, while saying the Prayer of Consecration, so stood that the people could not see him break the bread, or take the cup into his hand as alleged in the Representation."

Thus it was only through a want of direct evidence that the position of Mr. Ridsdale, with his back to the people, prevented them from seeing him break the bread, that he was not condemned on the charge. If the further evidence, that the people could not see Mr. Ridsdale break the bread, had been given, then the position would have been declared unlawful.

It is plain, then, beyond all controversy, that the Eastward position has not been in any sense legalized by this Judgment. Nay, more, it is clear from the Judgment that this position is not in accordance with the terms of the Rubric. Thus the Committee (after saying that if a rule were to be extracted from the Rubrics governing the position of the Minister throughout the whole Communion office, where no contrary direction is given or necessarily implied) declare that "they entertain no doubt that the position which would be required by that rule—a position, namely, in which the Minister would stand *at the north side of the Table*, looking to the south—is not only lawful, but is that which would in ordinary circumstances enable the Minister, *with the greatest certainty and convenience, to fulfil the requirements of all the rubrics.*" Here it is

clearly laid down that the position at the North side of the Table, looking South, and not the West side looking towards the East (viz., the Eastward position), is the most suitable and proper, and in accordance with the rubrical requirements. But the Judicial Committee go farther, and say that the Minister "must, in the opinion of their Lordships, stand so that he may *in good faith* enable the communicants present, or the bulk of them, being properly placed, to see (if they wish it) the breaking of the bread and the performance of the other manual acts mentioned." The adoption then of the Eastward position by the Minister is absolutely fatal to this right of the people, and is therefore inferentially condemned.

The Committee proceed to admit the difficulty in particular cases of saying exactly whether this rule had been complied with, but they very significantly add that "where there is good faith the difficulty ought not to be a serious one; and it is, in the opinion of their Lordships, clear that *protection* was in this respect intended to be thrown around the body of the communicants, which ought to be secured to them by an observance of the plain intent of the rubric."

Now, where there is "good faith" on the part of the Minister—the Judicial Committee, by a repetition of the phrase, emphasise its importance—the implied protection is given to the communicants, and the plain intents of the rubric are carried out by the Minister standing "at the North side of the Table looking to the South," and thus with the greatest certainty "he fulfils the requirements of the rubrics."

This, it need scarcely be said, is *not* the sacrificial position, and therefore any pretence of a sacrificial offering by the Minister is done away. Moreover, there is no "altar" whereon to offer sacrifice; and though the Lord's Table is referred to five-and-twenty times in this Judgment, relating to the position of the Minister, it is invariably called "The Table," or "The Communion Table," and never "The Altar," or "An Altar." This in itself is decisive upon the point that there is no sacrificing priest, and no material altar, known to the Church of England.

Before leaving this portion of the subject I may mention that a writer in one of the Ritualistic papers endeavouring to find a loophole of escape from the strict terms of the Judgment, said, that assuming the clergyman to stand with his back to the people it would be necessary for him to elevate the elements in order that they may be seen by the people, and that this "elevation" would be a gain from the Judgment. The passage to which I refer appeared in *The Daily Express* of May 24th, 1877, in a letter signed, "Richard W. Buraght," and runs as follows. The writer begins by stating that the Church Association by their prosecutions have already secured the legality of several doctrines and usages of the Church such as the writer enumerates. Among them and as far down in the list as No. 9 he places "Elevation by implication," and on that point he says "Elevation by implication, for in order to 'break the bread' and 'lay his hands upon the chalice' in the sight

of the people, the celebrant will have to raise 'the paten' and 'chalice' above his head, and there perform the 'manual acts,' raising his eyes towards 'the paten' and 'chalice' after the manner of elevation." But in the first place what is required is that the breaking of the bread should be seen by the people, which is not done in the act of elevating it; and secondly such elevation has been already judicially condemned. Thus the Ritualists are hemmed in on every side, and any attempt to change the Supper of the Lord into the Roman Mass can only result in ignominy and defeat.

To sum up on this point. The Northern position is declared the most suitable one; the Eastward position as obstructing the view of the people is inferentially condemned. And, as it is impossible to assume the Sacrificial position without violating the Rubric in that respect, there is not the slightest ground for supposing that any Sacrificial action, or even the appearance of such, is tolerated in the Church. No one can doubt therefore the testimony given by this decision to the Protestant character of the Church of England.

The difference between the Northern and the Eastward positions would, perhaps, be more clearly understood by a comparison of the Rubrics in the first and second Prayer-books of Edward VI. According to the first (A.D. 1549) the direction was that the Priest wearing Alb and Chasuble "*standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar*, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this Collect," &c., &c. According to the second Prayer-book (A.D. 1552) the Priest, whose authorized vesture was a Surplice, "*standing at the North side of the Table* shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this Collect following," &c., &c. The direction to stand "*afore the midst of the Altar*" lasted only for three years, and the liberty to assume the Eastward Position was then withdrawn for ever. Moreover the Lord's Table was never since that date, viz., the year 1552, allowed to be called "*an altar*." The Eastward Position, Altar, Alb, and Chasuble, and Sacrificing Priest, all necessary accompaniments for the celebration of "*The Mass Sacrifice*" vanished away; and there remained simply a clergyman clothed in a Surplice, standing at the North side of the Table where he could be conveniently seen by the people, administering to them for their souls' comfort the holy Sacrament of Christ's ordaining.

THE USE OF WAFER-BREAD.

To the second point not decided absolutely against Mr. Ridsdale, namely, the use of wafers or wafer-bread, I would now direct attention. Though the decision is not all that could be desired, and Mr. Ridsdale on merely technical grounds has escaped condemnation, the testimony which the Judgment gives to the Protestantism of the Church of England is no less remarkable. The case stands thus. In the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. (A.D. 1549) the following rubrical direction as to the bread appears.

"For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the Communion be made, through all

the realm, after one sort and fashion—that is to say, unleavened and *round* as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces.”

This was too much like the wafer-bread of Rome, though “without all manner of print,” and so in the second Book (A.D. 1552) we find the following substituted:—

“And to take away the superstition which any person hath, or might have, in the Bread and Wine, it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meals; but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.”

In our present Prayer Book the Rubric reads slightly different, thus:—

“And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.”

It will be observed that in the first quoted rubric the shape of the bread was prescribed. It was to be *round*. It was to be something different from bread usual to be eaten. In the second quoted rubric there is no requirement for the bread to be “round,” but in order to take away superstition, that is to prevent the offering of any reverence to it, it was to be the same sort of bread, though of best quality, as was usual to be eaten at ordinary meals.

The difference between this and the present rubric is very slight; and it is clear that the plain meaning of the direction is that the bread used should be the best of the sort usually consumed at meals, whereby the superstitions connected with the use of wafer bread could not possibly find place.

Now, the charge was, “that the Appellant used in the Communion Service and Administration wafer-bread or wafers—to wit, bread or flour made in the form of circular wafers instead of bread such as is usual to be eaten;” but the Appellant’s counsel maintained that there is no averment that the wafer, as “distinguished from bread ordinarily eaten, was used.” The Committee of the Privy Council were of opinion that this objection must prevail. In the concluding remarks on this point, the Lord Chancellor said that, “The practice of using fine wheat bread, such as is usual to be eaten, and *not cake or wafer*, appears to have been universal throughout the Church of England, from the alteration of the rubric in 1662 till 1840 or later. Their Lordships think that if it had been averred AND PROVED that the wafer properly so called had been used by the Appellant, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN ILLEGAL, but as the averment and proof are insufficient, they will advise an alteration of the decree in this respect.”

Here the illegality of “wafers properly so called” is distinctly laid down. Instead of being legalised they are condemned. Let due proof be given that such articles are used instead of “bread such as is usual to be eaten,” and the condemnation will take effect.

Thus again the Protestantism of the Church comes clearly out, and cannot be gainsayed by any.

The wafer of the Church of Rome is *not* in any sense "bread such as is usual to be eaten." It is a question whether it can be considered bread at all. But whether this be so or not, it is an object of superstition and worship in that Church; and to avoid the possibility of anything of the sort in the Church of England, plain ordinary bread, neither of wafer shape nor wafer substance, is required, and must be used unless this Judgment be set utterly at defiance.

CONDEMNATION OF THE CRUCIFIX.

Having now treated of the two points wherein Mr. Ridsdale's appeal was successful on the grounds of insufficiency of the evidence, the fact of the charge being attended with penal consequences having rendered it necessary that a direct violation of the Rubrics should have been clearly proved against him; I come now to consider the two cases in which the charges were fully sustained, and the condemnation of Mr. Ridsdale was confirmed, namely, those of the setting up of a CRUCIFIX on the top of a screen in the Church of St. Peter, Folkestone, and the use of the Sacrificial Vestments while administering Holy Communion. It will be convenient to take the case of the Crucifix first.

There can be no doubt that the setting up of images in Churches has been a great cause of superstition and idolatry. In the Homily on "the Peril of Idolatry" it is urged with great force of reasoning that the introduction of images into churches necessarily leads to idolatrous practices. The Second Commandment expressly forbids the worship of graven images, the bowing down to them or the making of them with any reverential object. It is plain that if such images were not made and set up, they could not be worshipped. And, therefore, the best mode of preventing the evil is to take away the cause. What God forbids man should not approve. What the Church of England condemns, the clergy of that Church should not uphold. In the case before us the Crucifix was set up without a faculty, which was a manifestly illegal proceeding, and is condemned as such. But the Committee were further of opinion that "the ordinary ought not to grant a faculty for the Crucifix." Referring to the Judgment in the case of Lord Penzance, the Committee say that the learned Judge arrived at the conclusion that the Crucifix in Parish Churches before the Reformation was not placed "as a mere architectural ornament, but as an object of reverence and adoration;" and that "the worship of it was enjoined in the Sarum Missal." The Committee, agreeing with Lord Penzance, who had stated that the Crucifix was an object which "both in the Church and out of it is *still worshipped* by those who adhere to the unreformed Romish faith," and sharing his apprehension "that what begins 'in decoration' may end 'in idolatry,' directed the removal of the Crucifix accordingly."

Surely this is a strong testimony to the Protestant character of

our Church in which there cannot be allowed those incentives to idolatry which are to be found in the Church of Rome.

THE SACRIFICIAL VESTMENTS.

And now coming, in the last place, to what it will be admitted is the most important question of all before the Judicial Committee, namely, the use of Sacrificial Vestments by clergymen of the English Church, I feel sure that there can be but one opinion among all sound Churchmen, that the decision is entirely satisfactory. The question was, whether under the Ornaments Rubric the vesture of the clergy to be "retained and be in use at all times of their ministration" was to be the surplice which had been in use since the Reformation, or whether Vestments, that is Chasubles, Copes, Albs, and Tunicles, used only in "the ministration of the Holy Communion" for the brief space of three years from 1549 to 1552, should be restored after three centuries of disuse. As I understand the question it is briefly this. During the three years mentioned, while the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., which contained several Romish errors, was in force, Sacrificial Vestments were authorized in the single service of the Holy Communion; but in the second Prayer Book, issued in 1552, this authority was withdrawn, and express directions were given that the minister, "at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither Alb, Vestment, nor Cope, but being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall wear a rochet, but being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only." Thus the surplice was from the year 1552 to be the uniform Vestment in the Communion and all other services, no distinction being made between them. The words of the present Ornaments Rubric, "at all times of their ministration," clearly require the same uniformity of vesture throughout all the services of the Church. These words alone would be fatal to the Ritualistic practice of making a difference in the vesture of the minister between the Communion and other services.

It will have been observed that the alb and chasuble were expressly forbidden more than three hundred years ago; and a remark of the present Bishop of London made in Convocation on July 10th, 1874, as reported in the *Guardian* Newspaper, may be cited here. His Lordship said that "all the evidence showed that before the end of Edward's reign the use of vestments had been discontinued. In fact *they were destroyed*, and a chasuble was a thing that could scarcely be seen." Now let me ask how could things that were forbidden and destroyed be retained? If the restoration of discarded garments for use in one special service of the Church, to the exclusion of all other services, was what was intended, it should have been plainly stated in the rubric; but the words "retained" and "at all times of their ministration" render the Ritualistic interpretation an utter absurdity.

The Judicial Committee have for the second time adjudicated on the question, and now, having heard the elaborate arguments of

Counsel of ability and acumen in defence of the priestly vestments, their decision must be considered final, and cannot in point of fact be questioned. That decision is, that those vestments are illegal, and cannot be used by any clergyman in the English Church. This is clear proof that the Holy Communion, according to the Church of England, is a divine ordinance, "showing forth," or as the words might be more correctly rendered, "proclaiming the Lord's death till He come." It is beyond all doubt that according to the recent Judgment the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not a Sacrificial offering, as the priests of Rome and Ritualism declare it to be. Thus the Protestantism of the Church shines forth clearly before the eyes of the whole nation.

Before proceeding to offer some further remarks as to the aim and object of the Ritualists in their endeavours to bring back those forbidden vestments of sacrificing priests, I hope I may be permitted to trespass for a little longer upon your attention, while I recall to your remembrance the vauntings of Ritualists in days gone by. There was a time when they were loud in their taunts and boastings that these were "the legal vestments," and that no others were so, —that they alone were obedient to the law, and that all others were disobedient. Then the "Authority of Parliament" was fully admitted and gloried in by the Ritualists; and those of the clergy who administered the Lord's Supper in the surplice were represented as lawless and rebellious. Now, it must be assumed that the Supreme Court of Appeal know best what the law on the subject is, and they have decided that these vestments cannot be legally worn by clergymen of the Church of England. As a result of this decision they who adorned themselves with these vari-coloured garments, and gave as their only warrant for so doing "the authority of Parliament," should now, when the law is clearly laid down against them, lay down the garments also. But instead of this many of them profess their determination to break the law, no matter what may be the consequence; thus proving by their recusancy that their former excuse for wearing vestments was a fiction, and that they can advance no claim to consistency of conduct, or sincerity of purpose. For they now aver that because the law has condemned them they will wear them; though they said previously it was because the law obliged them they did so. Thus excessive loyalty, ostensibly at least, has been changed into wanton rebellion, and the worst possible example has been set to the nation. This perversity of disposition is however only a cloak for dissimulation, as will be presently seen. What let me ask is the object in wearing these sacerdotal garments, gaudy, effeminate, and costly as they are, and wholly unsuitable for men engaged in the worship of Him who is "a Spirit and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth?"

In a word, the Chasuble, Alb, Tunicle, &c. are the garments worn by the priests who celebrate the Romish Mass; and they are intended to represent the purple robe, and other articles of our Saviour's dress at the time of His passion. The priests of Rome and the Ritualistic priests agree on this point, and their statement

is that, clad in these sacred vestments "the priest officiates in the person of Christ"—speaks His words, performs His actions, and works the stupendous miracle which they allege He worked in transmuting bread and wine into the manhood and divinity of the Son of God. To carry out this monstrous pretence the shapes and fashions of Chasubles and other vestments have been copied from old monumental brasses of deceased priests of Rome. The tailoring establishments patronized by Roman Catholic priests have been resorted to by their Anglican imitators to obtain the needful garments for their "mass in masquerade;" and the "modern Roman use," has been preferred to the old "Sarum use," as if to show how fully their sympathies are enlisted, and their hopes excited, by the Romeward movement in the English Church, now rendered more apparent than ever.

It is this scheme not only of an unhallowed imitation, but of a profane mockery of the most soul-thrilling event that ever took place on this earth, namely the offering up by sinful men of the spotless Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world, that this last, and it must be presumed irrevocably final judgment on the Chasuble question, has utterly crushed and extinguished. Henceforth it will be plain to men of all ranks and classes, of all creeds and parties, that the last flimsy pretence of English clergymen for decking themselves out with the meretricious adornments of an antagonistic Church has been torn away by the hand of justice; and they stand before the world denuded of the shreds and garments of an exploded priestism, arrayed in which they had been carrying on their pantomimic performances to the grief and disgust of all true sons of the Church of England.

I have already stated that the priest, when wearing the sacrificial garments, is said to officiate "in the person of Christ," and these garments are intended to represent the vesture worn by our Saviour. The whole Romish and Ritualistic Mass is intended to be a representation and continuation of the Great Sacrifice of Calvary. Thus, in the work entitled "The Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion," by the Rev. C. J. Le Geyt, of St. Matthew's, Stoke Newington (published by the "Church Press Company," 13, Burleigh Street, Strand), we have these expressive words—

"Imagine that you see the Blessed Virgin, S. Mary Magdalene, and the other Maries, going to Mount Calvary to BEHOLD CHRIST CRUCIFIED; endeavour to stir up in your mind such thoughts as you may suppose those holy persons to have had in this sacred pilgrimage, AS YOU ARE GOING TO BEHOLD THE SAME CRUCIFIXION THEY SAW, MYSTICALLY PERFORMED BY THE HANDS OF THE PRIEST." (Page 79.)

Thus the "altar" is a Calvary, and the priest is a crucifier of the Son of God afresh. In the same work the following appalling words are also to be found:—"PURE AND LIFTED UP TO HEAVEN SHOULD BE THE HANDS WHICH ARE USED TO HANDLE THE CREATOR OF HEAVEN AND EARTH." (Page 57.) Hence the meaning of the Ritualistic Mass—for "the Mass" is the name now given by the

leading Ritualists to the Communion Service—is, that the priests assume the garb, functions, and power of the Lord Jesus Christ; yea, so far beyond that, that they transform the bread and wine into His body and blood—that they handle Him with their hands—mystically perform “the same crucifixion” as was performed on Calvary—offer Him up anew on their pretended “altars;” and thus make of the whole service, according to the Roman model, “the death and funeral of the Lord Jesus Christ!”

This whole fabric of imposture and blasphemy has been utterly demolished by the late Judgment. There can be no longer any doubt that English clergymen offend against the law, and are punishable accordingly, in wearing the Sacerdotal Vestments, without which, be it remembered, they could not have the slightest pretence to be sacrificers. And such Masses as they presume to offer are both by the laws of the land, and the voice of the Church of England, nothing else than “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.”

The last pretext for indulging in these unholy and dishonest practices is now taken clean away; and none but recreants to the Church of England, and rebels against the Sovereign’s lawful authority, can ever again dare to use them in the performance of Divine worship under the name and authority of the Protestant reformed religion established by law.

CONCLUSION.

The Judgment of the Privy Council must commend itself to all moderate and judicious men. It vindicates the ritual practised by the Evangelical clergy, and corroborates the Protestant spirit of our Formularies. The clergy are forbidden to wear vestments which symbolize the functions of sacrificing priests, and they must so stand before the Holy Table as to be seen by the people. Viewing the Judgment as a whole, I think that the Church Association deserves the best thanks of all conscientious Churchmen for their having obtained so satisfactory a declaration of the law, and for having once for all set at rest any possible misgivings as to the Protestant testimony faithfully enunciated by the Church of England in her Articles, Homilies, and Formularies. We have every reason to thank God, and take courage; and instead of talking about forsaking the Church or disestablishing it, as the disappointed Ritualists are now doing, let us “gird up our loins,” and relying upon the promises of God’s Holy Spirit, endeavour in union with all true Christians, whether within or without the pale of the Establishment, to stand up for the Protestant Evangelical religion and the liberties of England.

We have seen how thoroughly Protestant is the whole framework of our Church, Throne and Constitution—how the principles of the Reformation are according to the decisions of our Courts interwoven with our Laws. The nation is in the possession of freedom because the Bible is our great Charter, and the pillars of our Constitution

are resting on the rock of Protestant truth. It will be for the people themselves to decide how long their privileges, bravely striven for, and nobly won, are to last. What was worth obtaining is worth defending. Not without the toil, the tears, the blood of our forefathers was the grand edifice of Truth and Liberty built up in the face of the world. Let us so act, in reliance on the Divine strength and favour, that it do not fall by attacks from without, nor be undermined by treachery from within. It is not in a narrow or sectarian spirit we carry on this warfare. We disclaim, though it seems almost needless to do so, any intolerance of spirit while battling for the common heritage of all the people of the kingdom against the common enemy of God's truth, and our nation's liberties.

It is natural perhaps that those who have neither truth nor loyalty nor justice on their side should cry out; but senseless abuse and groundless vituperation can hurt only those who use them. For our part we feel that the greatest calamity that could befall our country would be that she should pass again under the yoke of Rome. All other disasters are summed up in this. Those therefore are not true Britons—they are not loyal subjects, they are not English Churchmen, who would bring back a rejected superstition and an alien creed, and thereby restore a priestly supremacy against which our fathers contended to the death. The time has now come for making a determined effort, along the whole line, in defence of all that is dear to us as Churchmen and as Christians. In the words of Martin Luther we may say, "Here we take our stand—we can do no otherwise. God help us. Amen."

A 050290.1
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

BX
5125
.C48
1890
V.1
Church Association tracts. -- [London
Church Association, 1890?]
3 v. ; 22 cm.
Title from cover.
Contents: v. 1. Tracts 1 to 60 -- v.
2. Tracts 61 to 100 -- v. 3. Tracts 101
to 163.

1. Evangelicalism--Church of England.
I. Church Association (London) II.
Title: Tracts.

A050290.1
CCSC 23 AUG 88 16392329 CSTMxc

